ROME'S CONVICTION;

OR, A

VINDICATION

OF THE

Original Institution

OF

Christianity;

In Oppolition to the Many

USURPATIONS

OF THE

CHURCH of ROME;

And their frequent VIOLATION of

DIVINE RIGHT.

Cleerly Evinced,

By *Arguments* Drawn from their Own

PRINCIPLES;

And Undeniable Matter of Fact.

By *John Savage*., Gent.

London, Printed by *T. N.* for *Gabriel Kunbolt*, at the *King's Head* over againſt the *Mews*, near *Charing-Croſs*. MDCLXXXIII.

N

E

TO THE

MOST RENOWNED

MONARCH

Charles the II.

OF

England, *Scotland*, *France*

and *Ireland*

KING,

Defender of the Faith, &c.

Moſt Dread Soveraign,

WHither ſhould This TREATISE of *Religion* Fly for *Protection*, but under the Wings

of Your *Moſt Sacred Majeſty?* Duely Intituled to the Glorious Prerogative of *Defender of the FAITH;* Hither therefore it Connaturally tends: but makes its Approach in an Humble Poſture, Dazled, as it were, with the Glory of ſo much Majeſty. Its *Author* likewiſe Falls Proſtrate at Your Royal Feet, earneſtly Imploring Your PRINCELY Protection of theſe his weak Endeavors.

He

He comes Full Fraught with a Confident Hope, that where ſuch Power and Goodneſs Reigns, he cannot ſuffer a Repulſe. And being ſway'd by the *Memory* of Your *Paſt Favors*, the ſenſe of *Gratitude*, as well as *Duty*, hath Immutably Fixt him in this *Reſolve*: That a Deep-Rooted Loyalty, Animated with a Fervent Zeal for Your Majeſties *Royal Perſon*, Government, and

Prerogatives, ſhall ever be the Indeleble Character of,

Your Majeſties

Moſt Loyal, Moſt Submiſſive,

and Moſt Addicted Subject,

John Savage.

TO THE

Reader.

HAving had a more then ordinary inſpection into the Doctrine *and* PRINCIPLES *of the* Church *of* Rome; *I have (upon this Account) been earneſtly mov'd by ſome Perſons of Honor, and Worth, to Write ſomething in Oppoſition to that* Church; *and at length I was wrought to a Compliance. In the purſuit whereof, I have had no conſideration of the Unkindneſs and Ingratitude of ſome of the* Church *of* Rome *towards me, but have proceeded with all imaginable Candor and Sincerity, wholly deveſted of all Ranker,*

Spleen, and Animosity, against their Persons: But, I deem'd it no way repugnant to Christian Charity *to use my best endeavors, to open a way to Truth. And if sometimes my* Pen *seems to be Dipt in* Gall, *yet this only is a product of Zeal for the Doctrine I have undertaken to defend, in opposition to theirs, without the least intending to infringe the Laws of* Morality.

The Heads of Doctrine contained in each Disputation *of this* Treatise *I have several times Proposed to the Learnedst* Doctors *of the* Church *of* Rome *that I could meet with (of several Religious Orders)* quasi tentando, *by way of Discourse. One tells me, That these Difficulties were indeed insuperable, if scann'd by the Light of* Reason; *but yet we were all oblig'd to* captivare intellectum in obsequium

P. Worsleus Soc. Jesu Leodii.

ſequium fidei, *to captivate our Underſtanding in Obedience to* Faith. *Another Anſwers by way of Admonition, That it was not ſafe, but on the contrary very dangerous, to penetrate too deep into the Myſteries of* Faith. *A Third Alleadgeth, That I had as good Queſtion the Verity of* Scripture, *as ſubmit the Definitions of* Councils *to the Scrutiny of* Reaſon; *becauſe the* Scripture *alſo contains very great Difficulties, and ſeeming Contradictions.*

P. Haſeur Recollect. Namurci.

P. Derkennis, Soc. Jeſu, Lovanii.

To all theſe I Reply, That Divine Faith *conſiſts of Two parts; the Material Object, which is the thing we Believe, and the Formal Object, which is the Motive why we Believe, and that is* dictio Dei, *God's ſaying, or revealing it. Wherefore, when a Myſtery is propoſed to be Believed as an Article of* Faith, *though I have no Evi-*

dence in atteſtato, *in the thing Revealed, becauſe I cannot demonſtrate the* Truth *of it by* Human Reaſon; *yet if I have Evidence, or Certainty*, in atteſtante, *that is, I am ſure God ſays it; then with a Blind Obedience, and with a firm Adheſion, I aſſent to it: But if it be Doubtful, and Ambiguous, whether it be a* Divine Revelation *or no; then to Inſtitute a ſtrict Inquiry, Whether it be truly and really atteſted by* Divine Autority *or no, is an act of Prudence, and therefore not dangerous, but ſecure and laudable. But how ſhall we know aſſuredly whether it be a* Divine Revelation *or not?*

Firſt, *I Anſwer, That no New Revelations are to be admitted, but ſuch as are contained in* Holy Writ, *in the* Canonical Scripture.

Secondly, *I Anſwer, That if the Myſtery propoſed drive us to ſuch*

ſuch Extremities, that no Aſſent can be given to it, without denying ſome one of the Prima Principia Lumine Naturæ nota, *Firſt Principles known by the* Light *of* Nature, *which the Wit of Man cannot avoid, then we may certainly conclude, that if it be a new Doctrine not contained in* Scripture, *or if it be evidently inconſiſtent with the* Light of Nature, *in both caſes it comes not from God, but is a meer* Human Invention; *And we ought not to Believe by* Divine Faith, *that which is backt only by* Human Authority.

As for the Difficulties of Scripture, *thoſe which are Seeming Contradictions, are moſt* Hiſtorical, *and are Solved by thoſe* Authors, *who,* ex profeſſo, *have Written ſo many Large* Tomes *of the* Interpretation *of* Scripture. *Other Myſteries, which are Specula-*

tive and Doctrinal, as a Virgin *to Conceive; the Incarnation of the* Divine Word, *and the* Hypoſtatical Union; *the Myſtery of the* Sacred Trinity, *&c. there is no one of all theſe that is deſtructive of the Light of* Human Reaſon, *or that will reduce us to a neceſſity of denying the Truth of any of the Firſt Principles. Since therefore we admit of all* Canonical Scripture *as the* Word *of* God, *we ought to Believe it by* Divine Faith. *For certain it is, that as God's Infinite Veracity is uncapable of aſſerting ſuch things, as are impoſſible; ſo likewiſe, by the ſame Rule, God (who is the Author of* Human Reaſon) *is uncapable of Impoſing upon Man's Underſtanding, a neceſſity of Believing that which is falſe, or impoſſible; for if falſe, it is deſtructive of his Veracity, which would un-God him;*

him; *if Impossible*, *it is inconsistent with* Human Reason. *And yet all things are to be granted to the* Divine Omnipotence, *that involve not a manifest Contradiction.*

And this may serve as a Reply *to the* Answers *of the aforementioned* Doctors.

I shall therefore proceed, *in order to examine the* Controverted Difficulties, *which this* Treatise *contains*, *as they are digested under their respective* Heads, *whereof each hath his* Peculiar Disputation, *and the* Disputations *I Subdivide into* Sections.

In the Second Disputation *of this* Treatise *I have Inserted most of the* Antient Rituals *and* Liturgies *of the* Latine, Greek, *and the* Eastern Churches, *which* Morinus *Translated out of the* Greek, *and* Syrian *into* Latine. *And, as*

this Tranſlator *was tyed to give the* Literal Senſe *of the* Originals, *without* Mutation; *ſo alſo I deem'd it Illegal to make any change or alteration in the* Latin Verſion, *which in ſome places is obſcure, and obſolete, but I have rendered the true and genuine ſenſe thereof in* Engliſh, *to the beſt of my capacity.*

And becauſe the Pretended Infallibility *of the* Church *of* Rome *is the Foundation and main* Prop, *which ſupports their* Confidence, *Inductive to ſeveral* Determinations *and* Decrees, *whereby they ſeem to Wage* War *with* Heaven; *I deem'd it expedient in the Firſt Place, to Detect the* Weakneſs *of this* Foundation; *but, this being a Negative Deſign, the moſt proportionable means to accompliſh my end, is, to refel the* Arguments *which they produce, for*

the

the eſtabliſhing this Non-erring Prerogative.

And yet the Chiefeſt Argument *they Alleadge, is but a Fallacious* Illuſive Circle; *for, they prove the* Infallibility *of their* Church *by* Scripture, *and prove the* Canon *of* Scripture *by the* Infallible Teſtimony *of the* Church, *without Qualifying either Part, to prove the other, but Rely upon the Support; that theſe two Adminiſter to each other, which, in effect, is to prove neither.*

Notwithſtanding, I Inſiſt not much upon this Argument, *but mention it, and ſo proceed. I ſhould have Inſtituted a more* Minute Indagation *and* Refutation *of it, had I not ſeen it ſafely deduc'd, by a more* Learned *and* Skilful Pen; *and, with that Succeſs, that his* Antagoniſts *will ſcarce Attempt another* Conteſt

with him, in this Particular; for the Wit of Man, though back't with all their Learning, *will never be able to make it out.*

It ſeems ſtrange, how ſuch Points *of* Doctrine, *as are mentioned in this* Treatiſe, *and others alſo, not here Treated of, could be ſo Publickly Introduced into a* Church *of ſo Large an* Extent, *without great* Contention, *and* Inteſtine Broyles; *yea, without the leaſt* Oppoſition, *or* Contradiction.

For it is certain, that they have many amongſt them, who are very Learned, and Able Divines, *whoſe Intellects are ſufficiently qualified with deep* Penetration, *and* Perſpicacity, *and yet none* Reclaims, *nor calls thoſe Strange* Dogmatical Points *in Queſtion.*

Queſtion. The reaſon is, becauſe the Church *of* Rome *is ſo ſtrongly Immur'd, and Fenced on all ſides, and hath ſuch variety of Armes, and Weapons, to ſuppreſs her* Opponents, *that ſhe ſeems formidable to all; for, if any one, either by Word, or Writing, ſhould teſtifie any diſlike of her* Decrees, *or* Definitions, *he is firſt branded with the Infamous Note of an* Heretick; *and if he do not Recant, the* Church *hath other* Remedies: *next follows* Suſpenſion *from his* Prieſtly Functions; *there are alſo* Eccleſiaſtical Cenſures, *and* Excommunications; *there is* Excommunicatio Major, *and* Excommunicatio Minor; *ſome are* Latæ Sententiæ, *ſome* Sententiæ Ferendæ; *ſome are* à Jure, *others* ab Homine; *ſome are* Reſervatæ, *others* non Reſervatæ, *whereof*

there

there is a Long Catalogue *in the* Bulla Cœnæ; *there are alſo* Interdicts *for whole* Nations *and* Kingdoms; *And which is worſt of all, in* Italy *and* Spain; *if the* Sancta Mater Eccleſia *be oppoſed by any, there the* Inquiſition *lies gaping for them, and ready to Swallow them up Alive.*

All which ſtrikes the moſt Audacious of them into a Pannick Fear; they dread the Puniſhment, and therefore Induſtriouſly ſhun the Means of Incurring it.

Hence the Supine Neglect in their Divines *of* Attempting *to* Reforme, *or prevent ſuch* Errors, *though never ſo Repugnant to their Judgments; for, beſides the forementioned* Penalties, *they muſt alſo expect (if they be* Readers*) to be Depoſed from their* Theological

gical Chairs, *and Expell'd the* Academy, *and then* Degraded.

And hence that Profound Severity of their Popes *and* Councils, *in framing their* Definitions; *for being Conſcious of their Immunity from Oppoſition, they are hence raiſed to a Confidence of Attempting any thing.*

Wherefore, ſince none that are Subject to the Roman Juriſdiction *have ſo much Reſolution, as to Struggle with the many* Obſtacles *and* Arduity, *as they will certainly meet withal, to Obviate their Deſign, of Oppoſing thoſe* Errors.

I have here undertaken to Refute *ſome of them; in the Proſecution whereof I have taken a* Method *far different from that, of other*

other Learned, *and* Worthy Authors, *who have* Treated *of the ſame* Subject; *for, my main Scope and Drift, is to* Refel *the* Errors *of* Rome, *by their own* Principles; *wherefore I lay down their* Tenets, *before I eſtabliſh my own* Aſſertions, *hereby to make it appear, how little conſtant they are to themſelves; for their* Practiſe *and* Beliefe, *are wholly inconſiſtent with the* Dogmatical Principles *of their* Learnedſt Divines, *and ſometimes claſh with the* Definitions *of their* Popes, *and other* Councils, *which I ſhall make appear.*

So that this Bulwork *(though againſt them) is raiſed by their own* Labor *and* Induſtry, *and furniſhed with* Armes *and* Ammunition, *drawn from their own* Magazine; *yea, and* Mann'd *by their*

their own Oracles, *the* Divines; *for though they dare not apply their* Doctrine *to oppoſe the* Councils, *ſo to* Commence *an* Inteſtine War, *yet I ſhall here do it for them, and draw from thence ſuch* Illations, *as Legally Iſſue from their* Principles, *to ſubvert their* Pretended Articles *of* Faith.

Hence the Reader (*if not Præcautioned*) *may take occaſion to deem me a* Defender *of their* Doctrine; *whereas in Reality I only ſuppoſe it, according to the* Laws *of* Diſputation, Ad hominem, *to make ſuch Deductions from thence, as are deſtructive of each particular* Point *of their* Faith, *and* Practiſe, *which I Impugne; and this in effect is no other then to pronounce their Deſtruction by their own Hands.*

Perditio

Perditio tua ex te Iſrael. *For, though many of thoſe* Principles, *(which are the* Ground-Work *of my* Diſcourſe) *are common to both* Churches: *yet others there are, which peculiarly are admitted by the* Church *of* Rome *only.*

So we all agree in the Notion *of a* Sacrament, *but differ in the* Number *of* Sacraments, *&c. yet with them, I* Suppoſe (*not* Grant) Seven Sacraments; *thereby to make it Appear, that they* Tranſgreſs *againſt* Divine Right, *by Changing the* Matter *and* Form *of* Ordination, *and by* Invalidating Clandeſtine Marriage, *&c. which they Acknowledge to be both* Sacraments.

So that the Proofes *of the ſeveral* Poſitions *of this* Diſcourſe, *are*

are Reduc't to Formal, *or* Ritual Sillogiſmes, *whoſe* Premiſes *are made up, for the moſt part, of their own* Acknowledg'd Doctrine, *and* Matters *of* Fact, *both which are Undeniable; and this* Duality *is ſometimes back't with* Phyloſophical *and* Theological Principles, *or* Canon-Law; *all which they Admit of.*

And hence, by Legal Deductions, *is drawn the* Verity *of the* Aſſertions, *which are* Diametrically *oppoſite to their* Pretended Faith *and* Practiſe.

In the Proſecution whereof, I have confin'd my ſelf to as much Brevity, as is Compatible with the Right Underſtanding, and True Meaning, of the Reſpective Points *of* Doctrine *here Treated;*

for

for Prolix Perorations, *in ſo Serious a* Diſcourſe, *would be Irkſome to the* Author, *and Tedious to the* Reader.

And now I muſt Implore the Favor of the Benign Reader, *to Indulge me now and then, the uſe of* Scholaſtical Terms, *which, upon ſome Incident Occaſions, are more Pathetical, and Significant, in expreſſing my Meaning, then others, eſpecially conſidering, that in order to the ſtopping of all* Gaps, *and* Starting Holes, *I am ſometimes Neceſſitated, to Soar above the Ordinary Strain of* Doctrine, *to Evince the Coherency of my* Poſitions *with the* Principles *of* Philoſophy, *and* Scholaſtical Divinity, *which though* Abſtruſe, *and* Speculative, *yet is Avowed by their own* Champions.

Disputе I.

Of the pretended Infallibility of the Church of Rome.

The Preface.

THE natural and acquiſite knowledge of Man's intellectual Faculty could never pretend to any ſpecifical degree of Clarity, above thoſe obſcure Notions which by foreign Species we draw from ſeveral Objects; wherefore the Repreſentation being weak, the Underſtanding is ſeldom certainly aſſured of the true State of the Object. But the Church of Rome *pretends to a higher Prerogative, above the reſt of Mankind,* viz. *an* Infallibility *in her deciſions, that is, a determination to Truth, and an incapacity of falling into any Falſity or Error; wherefore I deemed it worth the Examination, whither this ſuperexcellent Faculty be grounded upon any ſure Foundation, or an aſſumed and pretended Priviledge, like his Holineſſes uſurp-*

ed Power to Lord it over Kings, and to Depoſe them, and diſpoſe of their Dominions at his pleaſure; as if Emperors, Kings, and Temporal Princes were but his Tenants at Will, and he the Proprietor, or Landlord.

SECT. I.

Wherein conſiſts the true Notion of Infallibility?

TO the end we may with greater perſpicuity trace the Divines of the Church of *Rome* in their Principles, we muſt firſt premiſe a four-fold Knowledge that the Underſtanding is capable of: There is an abſtractive, a quidditive, an intuitive, and a comprehenſive Knowledge. The firſt is a weak and imperfect repreſentation, fram'd by borrowed Species, gathered firſt by the external and internal Senſes, and thence tranſmitted to the Underſtanding, which are but virtual repreſentations, and as it were the Seeds of the Object, by means whereof the Vital Power, together with theſe Species, as con-cauſes, produce a formal image

image or repreſentation of the Object: And this abſtractive Knowledge, is peculiar to the State of Man in this Life. A quidditive Knowledge is a clearer Repreſentation, framed by the Underſtanding, inſtructed with proper Species, by means whereof it penetrates into the eſſential Perfections and peculiar Faculties of the *Prototypon*, or thing repreſented. An intuitive Knowledge is that which, by the proper Species of the exemplar, diſtinguiſheth in what State the Object is, whither exiſtent, paſt, or to come; and herein it reſembles that Science in God, which the Divines call *Scientia viſionis*. A comprehenſive Knowledge includes the two former; and moreover repreſents all the Perfections, Powers and Faculties of its Object explicitely, in order to all its Connotates and Correlatives, explicating diſtinctly all the variety of effects that may proceed from ſuch a cauſe, and diſcovering all and ſingular the innate Powers and Faculties thereof, with reference to all external Objects that have any connexion, dependence, or relation to it. And becauſe theſe external Objects are infinite, therefore this comprehenſive Knowledge

is peculiar to God alone, but the two former are imparted to the Bleſſed Angels and Souls of the Faithful, who by their Beatifical Viſion ſee God quidditively and intuitively.

Moreover there are three degrees of clarity, or certainty, whereby various Acts of the Underſtanding do variouſly repreſent their Objects. The firſt is Probability, which by reaſon of its weakneſs and imbecillity is always accompanied with a virtual or formal Ambiguity, and Fear that the contrary may be true, becauſe the motives that are inductive to the aſſent bring no aſſurance, but only a ſeeming reſemblance with the Truth. The ſecond is a Moral certainty, which, though there be a poſſibility of its failing, yet ſeldom or never errs; as one that never was at *Rome*, yet hath a Moral certainty that ſuch a City is extant, becauſe he hath often heard the concurring Teſtimonies of ſo many that have been there. The third and higheſt degree is the certainty of Infallibility, which is always accompanied with Truth, and imports alſo an incapacity of Erring, ſo that all Phyſical, Mathematical, and Metaphyſical demonſtrations, and all thoſe Truths which Philo-

Philoſophers call *Prima Principia*, as *Nihil poteſt ſimul eſſe & non eſſe. Omne totum eſt majus ſuâ parte. Quæ ſunt eadem uni tertio ſunt eadem inter ſe*, &c. all theſe are inveſted with the certainty of Infallibility. To this alſo belongs all acts of ſupernatural Faith, which are truly grounded on Divine Revelation.

This being premiſed, we now come to inſpect the peculiar nature of that Infallibility, which the Doctors of *Rome* attempt to affix to their Church: And though the word *Church*, taken in its greateſt latitude, include all the Members thereof, whereſoever diſperſed, yet their Divines commonly reſtrain the meaning thereof to an Oecomenical Council, indicted by the Pope, promulged by the Emperor, furniſhed with a ſufficient number of Fathers and Biſhops, wherein the Pope, by himſelf, or his Legate, preſides, and confirms the Canons and Decrees of the ſame, by his Apoſtolical Authority; ſo that a Council, with all theſe Requiſites, is that which they call the Church, and aſſert it Infallible in all its Canons and Decrees, yea and ſome of the Popes Candidates affirm, That his Holineſs alſo

participates of this high Prerogative, when he ſpeaks *ex Cathedra*, though no Council be then ſitting, which the Jeſuits, the Popes Minions, ſtruggle hard to maintain againſt others of the ſame Church.

Another difficulty hath been ſtarted amongſt them, How this Infallibility affects their Church? Whither it be an inherent quality, poſſeſſing the minds and underſtandings of the Fathers and Biſhops in Council, eſſentially determining them to truth; or elſe an extrinſical aſſiſtance, whereby the Holy Ghoſt inſpires them with Truth, and protects them from Error. But I leave them to debate theſe difficulties among themſelves, for it is not the ſcope of this preſent diſcourſe to examine what they call their Church, and how this Infallibility affects it, but only whither this ſingular favour be really granted to them, or whither they unjuſtly pretend a Right to it for the better ſatisfaction of their Followers, and making a more copious acceſs of Proſelites.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The Grounds of the pretended Infallibity *of the Church of* Rome *are propoſed.*

GReat Acquiſitions are ſeldom made and maintained without great Art and Induſtry. A conſiderable part of this ſublunary World, are wrought into a belief, That the Church of *Rome* is the only Oracle of the Univerſe, whoſe Doctrine is always true, and not capable of Error: how many Kings and Princes are ſwayed by this perſwaſion? and by this means teſtifie a high Reſpect and Veneration for the See of *Rome*, who Commiſſionates her Emiſſaries, the Divines, Preachers, and Confeſſors, to inculcate this Doctrine to the credulous Believers all the World over; and he who writes beſt on this Subject expects no leſs than a Cardinal's Cap, or a Biſhoprick, for his Reward: The Divine Prints it, the Preacher promulges it, and the Confeſſor takes hold of opportunity, times, and ſeaſons, to ſettle it in the minds of his Penitents. Princes

have commonly Divines, Preachers, and Confeſſors of their own Subjects and Nation, to whoſe conduct they preſume they may ſafely truſt the regulating of their Conſciences; yet theſe Men, though never ſo Heterogeneal in Dialect and National differences, make but one complex, or collection, of the Popes Negotiators, whoſe main ſcope and deſign is to maintain and improve the Prerogatives of their great Maſter, by all the ſubtle arts and ſedulous induſtry they are capable of: What plauſible Arguments do they uſe to perſuade people that their Church cannot Err? and the illiterate Vulgar greedily ſwallow this Bait, which confirms them in their ſervitude and ſlavery, and makes them prompt to ſubmit to all the Preſcripts of the See of *Rome*, not regarding the arduity thereof.

And among other marks of the Popes greatneſs, this of Infallibility is chief; for upon this Link hangs immediately his Supremacy, his Temporal pretended Power over Kings and Princes, *&c.* becauſe theſe Titles are deduced from his being univerſal Paſtor, which the non-erring Councils have declared him to be; ſo that the Councils Infallibility

is

is the Root of those Prerogatives, it is the main Pillar which supports the Magnificence and Greatness of the Church and Court of *Rome*, and if this should fail, that Superstructure would fall to utter Ruine and Desolation. This therefore is the great Bulwark which dreads no opposition; this is the main Fort that still remains immoveable against all attempts; this is the Ship of St. *Peter*, which though tossed and agitated upon the swelling Billows, by Raging and Tempestuous Storms, yet never sinks. Well may there be some attempts upon the out-works, by light Skirmishes and Velitations, in Controversies of less moment, which if by immediate Arguments they cannot repel, recourse may still be had to the main Fort, and if that begins to open upon the Enemy, by Thundring Infallibility in his Ears, Lord! who can withstand it? This will soon defeat him, and dissipate all his attempts.

First Proof.

But upon what grounds doth the Church of *Rome* arrogate to it self this high Character, in exclusion of all others? Why this is drawn from an irrefragable Testimony, it being grounded on the Promises of Christ himself; for

for this is the Church to whom Chriſt hath promiſed, That *the Gates of Hell ſhould never prevail againſt it*: This is the Church, to whom Chriſt's word is engaged to ſend it *another Paraclite, the Spirit of Truth, that ſhould lead it into all Truth.* This is the Church to whom Chriſt ſaid, *I will be with you till the end of the World.* And finally this is the Church, committed to the care of St. *Peter*, firſt Pope thereof, to whom Chriſt ſaid, *Thy Faith ſhall never fail*, which is meant of all other Popes, that by a lineal deſcent ſucceed him. And who dare attempt to evacuate Chriſt's Promiſes? Hence it comes to paſs that the Biſhops and Fathers aſſembled in a general Council, though of themſelves weak and ſubject to Error, yet being the chief Members of the Church, for Doctrine and Dignity, and being the Repreſentative of the whole, are render'd Infallible, as being backt by Divine Authority, by virtue of Chriſt's Promiſe; they do not now determine matters of Faith, and dogmatical points, as meer Men, but are as it were Deifi'd, in order to this Function, by a ſupernatural quality, infuſed into them, and inherent in their Intellects, or elſe by a previous

previous diſpoſition, and concomitant operation of the Holy Ghoſt, which determines them to Truth, and protects them from Error: They are but the Organ to deliver Truth, but the Divine Oracle is the Dictator; they are but the inſtruments which convey thoſe Myſteries to the knowledge of Mankind, but the Spirit of God is the principal Agent; ſo that their Canons and Decrees come from them full fraught with the Divinity, which renders them Infallibly certain; for the Holy Ghoſt, every Seſſion, attends the motion of thoſe great Men, to regulate all their Proceedings by the never erring Rule of his infinite Veracity, whence it enſues, that to pick quarrels with their Definitions is a high Temerity; it is to wage War with Heaven, or by the weak ſcrutiny of humane diſcourſe, to examine the truth of ſuch Myſteries as Heaven hath revealed; which if they ſhould contain any ſeeming Error or Contradiction, yet our underſtanding muſt adhere to them, as infallibly true, becauſe our Reaſon is guided only by obſcure Notions, and abſtractive Acts, which draws in foreign Species by the mediation of the Senſes, which give but

a glimmering light to the Underſtanding, and often ſuggeſt Falſity for Truth: but the Decrees of Councils are ſacred, and carry the Seal of the Holy Spirit enſtampt upon them, by whoſe directions they are framed; wherefore it is no leſs than a Sacrilegious Preſumption, to Queſtion the Truth of them, for this is to oppoſe Human Reaſon againſt Divine Authority. This is the ſubſtance of their firſt Proof, drawn from the Authority of Scripture, which at firſt appearance, ſeems great and glorious, a ſpecious pretence to work upon the credulity of the ignorant Vulgar.

The ſecond Proof is grounded in Reaſon; but before we propoſe it, we muſt open the way, by putting the Reader in mind that the Divine Word, the Second Perſon of the Sacred Trinity, conſidering the deplorable condition of Mankind, by the Fall of *Adam*, reſolved upon an efficacious Remedy, to aſſume Human Nature, and by an Hypoſtatical Union to be Phiſically United, and become one with Fleſh and Bloud, and in that Nature to ſuffer death, and thereby to offer to his Eternal Father an infinite Treaſure of Merits and Satisfaction, to make an attonement between God

God and Man, and to ſatisfie for Mans tranſgreſſions, even to the rigor of Juſtice, becauſe the ſatisfaction was made in the ſame ſpecifical nature that offended, and it was made to the full equality of the Crime, becauſe the Meritorious Cauſe thereof was a Divine Perſon, of infinite Dignity, and therefore his Actions were of infinite Worth. But becauſe it was not permitted to every individual Perſon to draw from that infinite Maſs of Satisfaction and Merit, in what meaſure he pleaſed (this priviledge being reſerved for the Pope alone to grant out of this ſtock by his Indulgences, what quantity, and to whom he deemed expedient) therefore a Church muſt be ordained, and a method preſcribed how to apply the benefit of Chriſt's Paſſion to each one in particular; To this end our great Redeemer inſtituted Sacraments, to be the organs and vehicles to convey the Fruit of his Paſſion to the Receiver; and this is *ſecunda poſt naufragium tabula*, whence the Church of *Rome* ſaith in her Publick Office, *O felix culpa quæ talem meruit Redemptorem.*

This being ſuppoſed, The ſecond Proof is grounded on this conſideration,

on, that the principal deſign of our Redeemer was to draw Souls to Heaven, notwithſtanding the loſs ſuſtained by Original Sin, for to this end he offered his ſatisfaction, to this end he merited habitual and ſanctifying Grace, tranſient and actual Graces, prevenient, concomitant, and ſubſequent Graces, to illuminate the Underſtanding, to move and incline the Will, to embrace Good, and ſhun Evil. Wherefore this being the end intended by Chriſt, it follows that apt and fit means were alſo appointed, that had proportion with the obtaining of this end; but one neceſſary means to accompliſh what Chriſt deſigned, is the Gift of Infallibility, without which the Church might fall into Error, and from one Error into another, and hereby deviate and ſwerve from its original inſtitution, and at length utterly fall away, and inſtead of conducting Souls to Heaven, it would lead them to the precipice of eternal ruine and deſtruction, and ſo evacuate the Fruit of Chriſts Paſſion, and put an obſtacle to the obtaining of that end which he efficaciouſly intended. And yet we muſt all ſuppoſe that the incarnate word was endu'd with an illimited Power,

er, his Knowledge and Wiſdom was infinite, ſo that he perfectly knew what means were neceſſary to accompliſh his deſign, and wanted no Power to effect it, which notwithſtanding could never be efficaciouſly attained, without this Infallibility; whence it neceſſarily follows, that Chriſt communicated to his Church this ſpecial Preſervative of always teaching truth, without being ſubject to Error. This briefly is the full ſtrength of their ſecond Proof.

Thus you ſee the grounds of this Doctrin are ſeemingly convincing, and plauſible enough to induce ſuch to an aſſent, who either cannot, or will not, by a ſtudious conſideration penetrate into the depth of them, but will rather acquieſce, than ſtretch their underſtanding by a rigid ſcrutiny and inquiſition to detect the fallacy thereof. But certainly in a matter of ſuch moment we are not to take up all this upon truſt, nor blindly to give our aſſent, till we have induſtriouſly waighed and ponder'd the whole matter, that ſo we may be the better able to give an account of our belief, which is the drift of the ſubſequent Section.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Deciſion of the preſent Controverſie.

THe Aſſertion is, That the Church of *Rome* enjoys not this Infallibility which they ſo much pretend to. The firſt Proof, Such a previous neceſſity to Truth, would deſtroy Liberty, and take away the laudability and merit of human actions. Note, That in the progreſs of this Diſcourſe I ſhall argue *ad Hominem*, that is, I ſhall take along with me their own Principles, and for the moſt part ground my Refutation upon them. They all grant Liberty and Merit in ſuch human actions as have conformity to the *dictamen* of Conſcience; for in this conſiſts the morality of our Actions, that they are conſonant or diſſonant to the *ſyndereſis* of the Agent, but if an action be extorted by an antecedent neceſſity, there can be no exerciſe of Free-will, nor Merit in it, nor Liberty, becauſe that Power only hath liberty, which after all præ-requiſites and cauſes are put, hath a power

power to work and not to work; whereas if there be a præ-ordination by Gods Decree, that the Members of a General-Council ſhall be determined to Truth, then their deciſions are wholly deſtitute of Liberty and Free-will, becauſe Gods efficatious Decree, that hath a previous influence upon the action, draws with it an indiſpenſable neceſſity which deſtroys Free-will; neither can it be meritorious, becauſe Merit ſuppoſeth Liberty, and conſiſts in the laudability of the action; and how can that action be laudable, which a fatal neceſſity forces from the Will? Can any one deſerve Praiſe for doing that which he cannot avoid?

Hence I conclude, that Merit and Free-will are not compatible with that Infallibility which the Church of *Rome* pretends to, which is inconſiſtent with Gods Providence, in order to Mankind, who was Created, and Born free, in full poſſeſſion of the liberty of his will, and therefore ſhall be Judged according to his own Actions, which could not be, were there any neceſſity or reſtraint put upon them: Thus we ſee how this doctrine inverts the order of Divine Providence, and impoſes a neceſſity, either

of contrariety, or contradiction upon Humane actions.

A confirmation of this Proof may be drawn from the practical proceeding of Councils, who ſeldom or never determine any thing till after a long and ſerious Debate, and ſometimes with great fervor and animoſity of Parties, in oppoſition to each other (as it hapned in the Council of *Trent*) upon contradictory Points, one Party Affirming what another Deny'd. All which ſuppoſeth a liberty in their debates and determinations; for if by an Inſpiration of the *Holy Ghoſt*, they were all fixt in Truth, What need any Debate or Conſultation? for this can only have place in ſuch Reſolutions as depend upon Humane Prudence alone. And if each Member of a General Council hath the immediate Aſſiſtance of the *Holy Ghoſt*, How comes it to paſs, that when two are of different Opinions, the one Denies what the other Affirms; and though they may both ſpeak as they think, yet in reality they cannot both ſpeak Truth, for two contradictories cannot be both true; Muſt then the Spirit of God be made the Author of both? as though he ſuggeſted Truth to the one, and Falſity

ſity to the other? if not, then he that contends for the Erroneous part, is deſerted by the Holy Ghoſt, and agitated by ſome other Spirit of the Prince of Darkneſs, which allways oppoſeth truth; but hence it would follow, that Satan acts in General Councils, and that ſome of the Members of Councils are not inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, and conſequently not Infallible.

The Second Proof is a Refutation of the Grounds of the Adverſe Party. A Negative Tenet, as this is, cannot be better prov'd, than by ſhewing the falſity of the Affirmative Contradictory; Firſt then, as to their Argument drawn from *Chriſt*'s Promiſes expreſt in Scripture. I demand, Whence they have an Aſſured Infallibility, that Scripture contains the True Word of God? They Anſwer, That this Infallible Church of *Rome* hath Defined it ſo to be, and propoſed it to the People to be ſo believed. I demand again how they make out the Infallibility of their Church? They Anſwer, By *Chriſt*'s Promiſes in Scripture. A ſpecial Argument, no better than a plain vitious Circle; for they prove the Infallibility of the Scripture, by the

Church, and the Infallibility of the Church by Scripture; and prove neither Independent of each other. By this way of Arguing *Mahomet* and his *Alchoran* may be prov'd Infallible. For the *Alchoran* ſaith, That *Mahomet* was inſpired by God, who ſpoke in his eare in the forme of a Dove; and *Mahomet* ſaith, That the *Alchoran* is the Word of God, manifeſted by Divine Inſpiration; therefore both *Mahomet* and the *Alchoran* are Infallible. This is the ſame Argument apply'd to another ſubject.

The *Proteſtant* Church of *England* hath as great a Veneration for Scripture, and as ſtrong and firm adherence to it as any can have, yet are not ſo highly preſumptuous as to arrogate to themſelves a degree of Evidence, or Infallibility exceeding that which the Motives Inductive to their Beliefe bring with them: But I ſhall not need to inſiſt upon the Invalidity of this Argument, becauſe it hath lately been ſo Learnedly handled by that Worthy and Profound Dr. *Edw. Stillingfleet* Dean of *Pauls*, and Chaplain in Ordinary to His Majeſty, againſt Mr. *Edw. Worſley*, a Learned *Jeſuite*, then reſiding at *Antwerp*,

werp, who had formerly, for many years together, been a Reader of *Divinity* in the *Jeſuits* Colledge at *Liege*, where he Taught the whole Body of *Divinity*, yet could never extricate himſelf out of this Labyrinth wherein Dr. *Stillingfleet* had involved him, by this Argument: to which I refer the *Reader*.

This Circle being therefore laid aſide, let us examine if the Scripture Independent of the Churches Definition, bring with it this Infallibility or no. The Scripture is queſtionleſs of it ſelf Infallible, but it is not ſo to us: for we have but a Moral certainty of the Infallibility of Scripture, and that it is truly, and *à parte rei*, the Word of God. The reaſon is, becauſe though we admit that what the *Prophets* and *Apoſtles* have left Written, was truly dictated by the *Holy Ghoſt*, yet they who drew Copies from thoſe Originals, wanted that ſupport, they were meer Men, and carried their Humane Infirmities about them, and in after ages, as the Scripture was handed down to Poſterity, the *Amannenſes*, by Ignorance, Malice, or Neglect, might commit ſome Error, either by exceſs, by defect, or by alteration, whereby their Copies might

diſagree with the Originals of the firſt *Hagiographers*, at leaſt we have no Demonſtration, nor Revelation to aſſure us of the contrary; and when *Printing* came in, the ſame difficulty occurs, in relation to them that Corrected the *Print*. But when it was Tranſlated into ſeveral Languages, the difficulty is yet greater; for beſide the former caſualties, admit the Tranſlator to be an exquiſite Linguiſt, yet the Senſe of Scripture is ſo very nice, that in his Tranſlation he might innocently expreſs, what the *Holy Ghoſt* by the Original never meant. Beſides, that only part of Scripture is admitted, by both Churches, as the Word of God, which is Canonical, And what Infallible Rule have we to know, what part is Canonical, what Apocryphal? Again, in that part that is received as Canonical, there are ſo many high Myſteries, ſome ſeeming contradictions, not pervious to the Natural capacity of Mans underſtanding to reconcile; the ſeveral ſenſes thereof are ſo various, ſome paſſages are to be underſtood Literally, ſome Morally, others Allegorically, ſome others Tropologically, or Figuratively. How many Volumes have been Written by the

the Learned in both Churches, to interpret the meaning and true ſenſe of Scripture? and in ſome places with Contradictions, and Oppoſitions, to each other, yet after all we fall ſhort of any Infallible Certainty herein: for inſtance, there have been above Fifty ſeveral Senſes given by Interpreters of that ſhort Sentence, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, *This is my Body.* And one Verſe in the *Pſalms* hath puzled the Learnedſt of them all, *viz. Increpa feras arundinis, congregatio taurorum in vaccis populorum, ut excludant eos qui probati ſunt argento*, in *Engliſh* thus: *Rebuke the wilde beaſts of a Reed; the congregation of Bulls in the Cowes of the people, that they may exclude thoſe that are tryed with ſilver.* Inſtances of this nature are frequent in Scripture. Humane Tradition hath brought the Scripture down to theſe our times, yet Humane Authority is not Infallible, wherefore all theſe particulars being duly ponder'd, Where will the *Romaniſts* find that aſſured Infallibility which they pretend to? Pſal. 68. v. 30.

As for the Second Proof from the ſtrength of Reaſon, we admit *Chriſt*'s Omnipotence, Omniſcience, his infinite Prudence, and Wiſdom, with all other

his Divine Attributes; we alſo grant that our Redeemers Intention of being Incarnate, Suffering Death, *&c.* was to ſave the Souls of Men; but this was to be conſiſtent with, and ſubordinate to that ſtate wherein the Almighty, by his infinite Wiſdom and Providence, had placed Man in his firſt Creation, that is, with a full poſſeſſion, and uſe of his Liberty and Free-will, which our Redeemer never intended to infringe, for that would ſubvert the Order of Gods former Providence: So that by the Fruit of *Chriſt*'s Paſſion we are furniſhed with all neceſſaries to live a godly and a righteous Life, which without the Grace of *Chriſt*, would not be in our power to do, for bare Nature hath no proportion of it ſelf to Merit, *ne quidem de congruo*, nor to any Supernatural Reward, as St. *Auguſtine* Teacheth, againſt the *Pelagians* and *Maſſilienſes*: ſo that the Supernatural Graces that we receive by *Chriſt*'s Merits, give us a power to do good, and ſhun evil, but impoſe no neceſſity upon us to lay hold of them, and improve them to our own good, for this depends upon our own free election; therefore when we tranſgreſs againſt Gods Precepts, it is not for want

want of all neceſſary means to obſerve them, but it proceeds from the Pravity of our own Wills, which chuſe rather to follow the ſuggeſtion of the ſenſual appetite, than ſubmit to the conduct of Reaſon, and therefore are blameworthy, for we had the power to do good, and avoid evil, and would not.

So that although of our ſelves we can do nothing in order to heaven, yet every individual Member of the Church, by the Grace obtained by *Chriſt*'s Paſſion, is enabled, but not neceſſitated, to ſave his Soul. *Non ego ſed gratia Dei mecum.* It is not *I*, but the Grace of God with me. And if the Church ſhould fall into an Error (as the Church of *Rome* hath done) the members thereof are not thereby deprived of the uſual Means of Salvation, neither doth that Error prejudice them as long as they remain in an invincible Ignorance of the Truth. But if the Church by multiplying error upon error, ſhould fall from being a Church, which could not be, but that the wiſeſt and moſt learned ſhould take notice thereof, and detect the errors, then theſe are bound in conſcience to deſert it, and deteſt their errors, who conſequently would remain

remain constant and faithful to truth, and so would continue the True Church.

And indeed, the Second Proof proposed in the Second *Section* proves too much, and is to be solved by the *Romanists* themselves; for they Assert, that the end of *Christ*'s Suffering was to save all Mankind, that is, every single person of Humane Nature, and therefore apt and proportionable means ought to be instituted, without which this end could not be efficaciously obtained; whence it ensues, that every individual person must have this Infallibility, yea, and impeccability also, lest *Christ*'s design should be frustrated: which is the same way of Arguing as is contained in that Proof, and the illation as evidently ensues; which notwithstanding we all grant false and erroneous, for then none could be damned. Thus you see the grounds of the *Romans* Infallibility, how specious and convincing soever they appear, yet thoroughly examined, and the fallacies detected, they vanish to smoak.

The Third Proof: That Church which hath committed Errors, and still perseveres in them, is not Infallible; But

But the Church of *Rome* hath committed errors, and ſtill perſiſts in them, as I ſhall prove in the following Diſputations of this *Treatiſe*, *ergo*, The Church of *Rome* is not Infallible: for that Church that actually doth erre, hath a power to erre, becauſe *bene valet ab actu ad potentiam*; and it is evident, that that Church which hath power or capacity to erre, is not Infallible; for Infallibility excludes a power of failing.

There yet remains to ſolve ſuch Objections, as may be propoſed againſt our Aſſertion contained in the beginning of this *Section*.

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.

An Anſwer to the Objections propoſed againſt the nullity of the Church of Rome's *Infallibility.*

THE firſt Objection: None can Queſtion but that ſuch Promiſes as our Redeemer hath truly made to his Church, ſhall be fulfilled; but we have a Moral certainty, that the Promiſes ſpecifyed in the Second *Section* were truly made by *Chriſt*, for we admit a Moral certainty, That the *Holy Scripture* is truly the *Word of God:* Whence it enſues, that we are Morally certain that the Church of *Rome* is Infallible.

Firſt, I Anſwer, That this Objection deſtroys it ſelf; for it contends for an Infallibility, and proves it by a Reflex act of Moral certainty; whereas Infallibility excludes a power of Erring, and Moral certainty includes that power, ſo that the reſult of both would be, a Fallible Infallibility, which involves a Contradiction. This is

is much of the nature of a Sillogiſme, wherein the concluſion *ſemper ſequitur debiliorem partem*; ſo that if one of the premiſes be ſcientifical, the other only probable, the concluſion will be only probable; the reaſon is, becauſe in the concluſion, the two extreams are therefore identifi'd between themſelves, becauſe they were in the premiſes identifi'd with a third; wherefore if one extream be certainly identifi'd with a third, the other only probably, they can but be probably identifi'd with each other, for this identity is deſtroyed by ſeparating either of the extreams from the third. For application, The Infallibility of the Church depends upon theſe two Principles; *Firſt*, That we are Infallibly certain that *Chriſt*'s Promiſes are performed. *Secondly*, That we are Infallibly certain of the thing of fact, that *Chriſt* did Promiſe; if either of theſe fail, the Infallibility faileth; and if either of theſe be only probable, the Infallibility is reduced to a probability only; now though Moral certainty be the higheſt degree of Probability, yet it comes as far ſhort of Infallibility, as this Argument doth of proving it.

Secondly. I

Secondly, I Anſwer: That the Church of *Rome* is too forward in arrogating to themſelves alone, ſuch Promiſes as *Chriſt* made to his Church; for to ſay nothing of the Church of *Rome* in Primitive times, yet ſince their manifold Innovations and Superſtructures, the *Proteſtant* Church is the purer, and freer from Error; and conſequently hath more right to lay hold of thoſe Promiſes then the Church of *Rome*.

The Second Objection: Though the Church, taken barely by it ſelf, and without the ſupport of that Teſtimony from *Holy Writ*, ſhould not be Infallible, yet backt by the Motives of Credibility, it will be rendred abſolutely unerrable; for theſe Motives do ſo peculiarly affect it, and as it were point it out to be the True Church of *Chriſt*, that it diſſipates all the Clouds of Ambiguity, which blind the incredulous; For who can conſider the lineal deſcent and ſucceſſion of Chief Paſtors, the auſterity and holineſs of life exerciſed in Monaſteries, of both Sexes; the Miracles wrought by the Members of this Church, with the Blood of ſo many

many Martyrs, the effuſion whereof doth daily irrigate the ſame, and renders it more fertile, with other Motives of this nature, which all are the Badges of this Church. Who, I ſay, can ſeriouſly ponder this, without framing an Infallible Judgment, that the Church of *Rome* is the True *Church* of *Chriſt*? There is certainly a ſtrict and Metaphyſical connexion, between theſe Motives, and the True Church, for it is not conſiſtent with the Divine Goodneſs, and veracity of God, to co-operate to ſuch a Deluſion, as this would be, if theſe Motives ſhould indicate a Falſe Church, ſubject to Error, which would make God himſelf the Author of this Error: We may therefore hence conclude, the Church of *Rome*, in which ſuch great Wonders are ſo frequently wrought, to be the True, and Infallible Church of *Chriſt*.

The *Firſt Anſwer*: Among all the Doctors and Divines of the Church of *Rome*, I never knew of any that aſſerted this ſtrict and metaphyſical connexion of the Motives of Credibility with the True Church, but only Cardinal *Lugo*. Yet I have ſeen a whole Torrent of

Autority

Autority of other Doctors of the ſame Church, of the contrary opinion, who all affirm, that the collection of theſe Motives, may poſſibly affect a falſe Church; wherefore let theſe Authors ſolve this Objection.

The *Second Anſwer.* All theſe Motives of credibility are fallacious, as depending upon Humane Autority, and being ſubject to many caſualties and deceits; and firſt for the ſucceſſion of Chief Paſtors, whoſe Juriſdiction, by an Illegal Uſurpation, extends it ſelf *de facto*, over the whole Body, but is limited *de jure*, to the Dioceſs of *Rome* only; and how long together hath the Body been without a head, as if it had been defunct? and then Monſter-like, it appeared with two heads, it being hard to decide which of them had moſt right. And what is to be ſaid of *Liberius* Pope, who ſubſcribed the *Arians* Hereſie, and joyned with them; and of *Vigilius*, who approved and condemned the ſame Doctrine in the three Chapters? Muſt theſe alſo be links of continuation in the Succeſſion? Surely they were not Infallible. Conſider the manner of their Election, when there occurs

curs a vacancy, there will not be wanting those in the Colledge of Cardinals, who have ambition enough to aspire to such a dignity, whereto is annexed a Temporal Principality, a Triple Crown, with many splendid Titles, which makes the Succession sure; But how few are there in the Consistory, who are swayed by Piety, and Religion, to give their Suffrage only for such a Person as is duely qualified for so high a Prelacy? But, when they have entred the *Conclave*, What a Bundle of Ambition is there shut up together? How many are there that take their Measures from By and Sinister ends? some from Ambition, others from Humane Policy, others again from Self-interest; some give their Votes for such a Cardinal, because he is of the *Spanish* Faction, they having a Pension to uphold that Faction. Others chuse another, because he is of the *French* Faction, whose Pensioners they are; Others chuse one who is most addicted to themselves, hoping that by his Promotion, they shall become great and powerful; another again, who conceives himself fit to be elected, casts away his own Vote upon one that is most unlike to be chosen, lest his Suf-

frage, by making acceſs to the Party of his Competitor, ſhould promote him, and deprive himſelf of ſo high a Dignity. What ſtuff is this, to have an influence upon the Electors of a Chief Paſtor? nay, How remote is all this from Infallibility? As for Auſterity, I believe that many out of a true Motive of Piety are wrought to imbrace it; But how many more are there that glory in their groſs and vile habit, and ſo are proud of their ſeeming Humility? and in ſtead of holineſs of life, How many enormous crimes are committed within thoſe private Walls? they have their Pride, Ambition, and Factions one againſt another, eſpecially among the Female Sex. For Miracles, How many thouſands have been cry'd up as true, and afterwards decry'd, when the Fallacy was detected? And how many have the repute of Martyrs, who in reality were Malefactors, deſerving death? But how many Martyrs have the *Romaniſts* made in *England*, by putting them to death meerly *in odium fidei*? wherefore it is plain and evident, that all theſe particulars being doubtful and uncertain, no Infallibility can be hence evinced.

The

The Third Objection: They whoſe reaſon and underſtandings are convinced of the truth of the *Roman* Religion, are bound in conſcience to believe it as the true Church of God. For there is a Divine Precept ſtill incumbent upon them, which commands them not to ſin; therefore it commands them the neceſſary means to avoid ſin: but as they ſtand convinced, the neceſſary means to avoid ſin, is to believe it to be the true Church of God; but it cannot be, that God ſhould command Men to believe an error, or that which is falſe; therefore it is an infallible truth, that the Church of *Rome* is the true Church of *Chriſt*: for elſe God would command us to believe falſity, and error, and ſo God himſelf would be the Author of it.

Firſt, I Anſwer, by retorting this Argument: The *Greeks*, for Example, who hear their learned Doctors, and Preachers Explicate and Preach their Doctrine of the Trinity, that the *Holy Ghoſt* doth not proceed from the *Father* and the *Son*, but only from the *Father* by the *Son*, which they propoſe

with ſo much plauſibility, and ſeeming truth, that the hearers are convinced of the truth thereof, as belonging to Faith; in this caſe God commands them not to ſin; and conſequently commands the neceſſary means to avoid ſin, which is to believe that Doctrine as an Article of Faith; which notwithſtanding is falſe and erroneous. I aske the *Romaniſts*, Whether in this caſe God commands the *Greeks* to believe this error? and if they ſolve this Argument, they will ſolve their own.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That in the caſe propoſed in the Argument, I admit a Precept of not ſinning; but I deny any Precept of believing the Church of *Rome* to be the true Church of God. Nay, ſuch a belief, upon the firſt appearance of truth, would be a ſin; for ſuch an eaſie belief, upon ungrounded, though plauſible Arguments, in a matter of Moment, is an act of raſhneſs, and temerity, which, I am ſure, are no vertues; and conſequently not commanded by Gods Precept. The reaſon is, becauſe where there are ſeveral means to attain an end, though the end be under Precept, yet no means in particular falls

falls under the ſame Precept, as in the caſe propoſed, They who ſeem to be convinced of the truth of the Church of *Rome*, ought in prudence to ſuſpend their Judgment, to Read *Authors* that Treat of ſuch matters, to Converſe with Men of Integrity, Piety, Knowledge, and Learning, and then ſeriouſly to ponder, and maturely to conſider the whole matter; this is an act of Prudence, and Diſcretion, and conſequently no ſin; ſo that the Perſons in the Caſe propoſed are not reſtrained to one only means of avoiding ſin, but may make uſe of any that is fit, and apt in order to that end. Elſe they muſt acknowledge the *Proteſtant* Church to be True and Orthodox: for they who are convinced that this Church is the true Church of *Chriſt*, are commanded not to ſin; and ſo to believe that the *Proteſtant* Church of *England* is the True Church of *Chriſt*, which muſt be ſo, becauſe God cannot command us to believe an Error.

But you may Inſtance, That an Infallible Church is certainly better then a Fallible one, and the infinite goodneſs of God is ſuch, as always to determine him to do that wich is beſt;

and consequently in this case hath made his Church Infallible, this being best. I Answer: The Principle on which this Instance is grounded, is commonly rejected by the *Roman* Divines; for though *Granado* a *Spanish* Jesuite doth fusely contend to establish a necessity in God to do always that which is best; yet I have heard him earnestly impugned by other Professors of Divinity, of the same order, and in the same Colledge of St. *Hermeingildus*, where *Granado* himself Taught it, and Printed it; and though he have some Sectators in this Point, yet a far greater number of Doctors, of several Orders, Teach the contrary.

In 1 partem, D. Thomæ.

The case stands thus: Here are two of Gods Attributes, *viz.* his Liberty, and Infinite Goodness, brought in competition with each other: *Granado*, to maintain the Goodness of God, detracts from his Absolute Liberty, and Freedom; which notwithstanding is as Essential to God, as his Goodness. Other *Authors* industriously contend to defend the Attribute of Goodness, without prejudice of liberty; for without any such fatal necessity of restraining the Omnipotent,

potent, he hath an ample field wherein to display his Goodneſs. That we have our Being is an effect of Gods Goodneſs; that we are repleniſht with all Neceſſaries, and Conveniences in this life, flows from his Bounty and Goodneſs; that we were Redeemed when we were loſt in *Adam*, was Gods great Goodneſs towards us; that we are now furniſhed with all Neceſſary Means of Salvation proceeds from Gods Goodneſs; and the Ineffable and Eternal Goods of Heaven, which we hope for, are no other then the products of Gods Infinite Goodneſs and Mercy. Beſides, we are no competent Judges whether a Fallible, or Infallible Church be beſt; for the ſecond in it ſelf ſeems beſt to us; yet the All-ſeeing Eye of God, who perfectly comprehends all the circumſtances thereof, together with all the combinations and Subordinations of one thing towards another, in relation to the Divine Intention, it may be, for ought we know, that a Church liable to error, All things conſidered, may be the beſt.

Thus you ſee, according to my intended purpoſe, I have delivered the Subſtance of what I Deſigned in this mat-

ter, Methodically, and with as much Brevity as was consistent with the clear understanding of the same; Wherein, *First*, I proposed several Principles and Maxims of the *Roman* Doctors, necessary and useful for the subsequent Discourse. *Secondly*, I gave you the grounds of their pretended Infallibility, without dissembling any thing of their full strength. *Thirdly*, I set down my Tenet, and Proofes thereof, destructive of that Infallibility. And *Fourthly*, I solved their Objections: which Method I shall observe for the future, and hereby we may consider, upon how weak a foundation, this Main Pillar of the Church of *Rome* is grounded, whereby the whole structure becomes disjoyned, and ruinous.

Disputatio II.

Diſpute II.

Of the Intrenchments of the Church of Rome *upon Divine Right, by changing the Eſſentials of their pretended Sacraments.*

The Preface.

MAny Cenſures of the higheſt ſtrain, hath the Church of Rome *thundered out againſt the* Proteſtants, *for Separating from her Communion, and deſerting her Tenets in that Latitude, as ſhe profeſſeth them; whereas, notwithſtanding, the* Proteſtant *Church, did moſt Religiouſly imbrace all the Doctrine and Practiſe inſtituted by* Chriſt, *and expreſt in Holy Writ; and rejected only the Corruptions*

tions and Innovations, which had no Autority but Humane; She ſeparated the pure Gold from the Droſs, and the Wheat from the Cockle; and by this means continued the true Church of Chriſt, *pure and undefiled. But what Cenſure doth the Church of* Rome *deſerve, who, by a bold and a high attempt endeavoureth to incroach upon Divine Right, by making a change and reformation, in the Original Inſtitutions of* Chriſt *himſelf? as ſhall appear by the ſeveral* Sections *of this Diſputation.*

SECT. I.

Of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome *relating to this preſent Controverſie.*

THere are various Principles, and Dogmatical Deciſions, of the Church of *Rome*, much conducing to this preſent Diſcourſe, whereof ſome are defined by their General Councils; others are promiſcuouſly Taught and Aſſerted by their Divines. And becauſe I here intend to argue *ad hominem*, that is, out of their own Doctrine; I ſhall therefore do them no wrong, by drawing ſuch illations

lations from thence, as ſhall clearly evince their violating of Divine Right; by endeavouring, as much as in them lyeth, to make an Eſſential change in their Sacraments, which they acknowledge Inſtituted by *Chriſt* himſelf.

Firſt therefore, They admit Seven Sacraments, to wit, *Baptiſme, Confirmation, Euchariſt, Pennance, Extreme Unction, Order* and *Matrimony.* And though they ground themſelves upon ſeveral Texts of Scripture miſunderſtood for the practice of them, yet it is a buſineſs of greater arduity to prove them all Sacraments; but to ſatisfie their Sectators, they need no more then to tell them, that theſe are all defined, to be Sacraments, by the Council of *Trent*, in theſe words; *Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis non fuiſſe omnia à Jeſu Chriſto Domino Noſtro inſtituta; aut eſſe plura vel pauciora quam ſeptem, videlicet, Baptiſmum, Confirmationem, Euchariſtiam, Pœnitentiam, Extremam Unctionem, Ordinem, & Matrimonium: aut etiam aliquod horum ſeptem non eſſe verè, & propriè Sacramentum; Anathema ſit.* If any one ſhall ſay, That the Sacraments of the New Law were not all Inſtituted by *Jeſus Chriſt* our Lord: Or that they *Trid. Seſſ.* Can. 1.

are

are more or fewer then Seven, namely, *Baptiſme*, *Confirmation*, *Eucharift*, *Pennance*, *Extreame Unction*, *Order*, and *Matrimony*; or alſo, that any one of theſe, is not truly and properly a Sacrament, let him be Accurſed. But becauſe it is not the drift of my preſent deſign to examin the truth hereof, I ſhall therefore wave it, and only ſuppoſe it to be their Doctrine.

Secondly, They admit, that all Sacraments were Inſtituted by *Chriſt* himſelf, for as much as concerns the Eſſence and Subſtance of them, and conſequently it exceeds the limits of any Humane Power, either to abrogate, or to alter any thing of that which is by Divine Right eſtabliſhed, and that they were all Inſtituted by *Chriſt* is alſo defined by the Council of *Trent*, as above, and Aſſerted by their Divines.

Thirdly, In every Sacrament they diſtinguiſh between the Eſſential, and Accidental parts of it; the Eſſential parts they place in the matter and forme; the Accidental parts are the Ceremonies, Prayers, Unctions, and Actions, which are uſed in the Adminiſtration of them, which

which they call not *Sacramenta*, but *Sacramentalia*. And whensoever the Essential parts are daily applyed to the Receiver, though the Accidental parts are omitted, yet the Sacrament is valid: But if either of the Essential parts be wanting, that is, if either the true matter, or the true forme which *Christ* instituted be not applyed, then the Sacrament is void, as their Divines Teach: For example, in the Sacrament of *Baptisme* there is *materia proxima*, and *materia remota*, a remote, and an immediate matter: the remote is the natural Element of Water, the immediate is the Lotion, or the action, whereby the Baptiser applyes the Water to the Baptised; during which action the Essential Form is to be pronounced by the Baptiser in these words: *I Baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.* In this matter and forme consists the whole Substance and Essence of this Sacrament, and therefore if by reason of the weakness of the Child, or by any other incident casualty the other Ceremonies cannot be performed, yet the Child is Truly Baptized, though performed by the Midwife, or any other person, because

all

all the essential parts of Baptism, instituted by Christ, are duly applyed to the Child, though the Unctions, Prayers, and other Ceremonies be omitted; and they insist so earnestly upon these essential parts, that in case no other Water could be had but Rose-water, or some other Liquor that hath affinity with Water, they hold the Sacrament not valid, because the Matter instituted by Christ is wanting, which is the natural Element of Water.

Fourthly, They hold that though the Matter and Form be the whole Essence of the Sacrament, yet if they be not conjoined so as to make up one thing, the Sacrament is nul, and of no effect; for the form must be applied to the matter, and have a moral concomitance with it, or else it cannot have a moral union with the same; if therefore the Water in Baptism be applyed to day to the Baptised, and the form pronounced to morrow, there will be no Baptism, nor Sacrament, for the words would be false, which signifie a present Lotion.

Fifthly, Of all the seven Sacramentss which they admit, they assert that only

ly three, to wit, Baptiſm, Confirmation, and Order, do imprint upon the Soul of the Receiver an indelible, ſpiritual Character, never to be blotted out, ſo as thoſe Souls which receive any of theſe three Sacraments, after ſeparation from the Body, will appear in the next World, with theſe characteriſtical Notes inſtampt upon them, ſome with one, ſome with two, others with all three, according to their reſpective differences, they having an eſſential diſcrepation from one another, each of them denoting the Sacrament from whence they proceeded. Hence they infer, that none of theſe three Sacraments, when once validly conferr'd, can be reiterated, or received twice by the ſame Perſon, and that it would be a Sacriledge to attempt it; becauſe they fruſtrate the effect of the Sacrament; yet if there ariſe any doubt of the validity of the former collation, then a ſtrict inquiry is to be made how grounded that doubt is, and if it be ſtill found ambiguous, then that Sacrament is to be again conferr'd *ſub conditione*. But if it be evident that there was wanting either the true matter or the true forme, which are all the eſſentials

tials, or the right intention of the Administrer (which is also necessary;) In this case the Sacrament is to be conferred again *absolutè*. Having thus made a brief reflection upon the Principles, and Practise of the Church of *Rome*, in what relates to this matter: I now proceed to prove *ad hominem*, their trespasses against Divine Right, by deviating from Christs Institutions, and introducing in place thereof their own humane inventions, but shall desire you first to take a cursory view of the ancient Rites of Ordaining Priests.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The Practiſe of Antiquity in the Collation of Prieſthood.

ORdination is received amongſt the *Romaniſts*, not only as a Sacrament, but alſo as one of thoſe that imprint a Character. So the Council of *Trent*: *Si quis dixerit ordinem, ſive Sacram ordinationem, non eſſe verè, & propriè Sacramentum, à Chriſto Domino inſtitutum*, &c. *anathema ſit.* And again, the ſame Council declares: *Si quis dixerit, in tribus Sacramentis: Baptiſmo ſcilicet, confirmatione, & ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc eſt ſignum quoddam ſpirituale, & indelibile, unde ea iterari non poſſunt, anathema ſit.* If any one ſhall ſay, That Order or Holy Ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament, Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, let him be Accurſed. And if any one ſhall ſay, That in three Sacraments, to wit, *Baptiſm*, *Confirmation* and *Order*, there

Conc. Trid. Seſs. 23. Can. 3.

Trident. Seſs. 7. Can. 9.

is not Imprinted in the Soul a Character, that is, a certain Spiritual Sign, not to be blotted out, and therefore cannot be renewed, let him be Accurſed. And to this ſubſcribe all their Divines; which their Univerſal Practiſe and Belief confirms. There are ſeven Orders in uſe among them. *Septem ſunt ordines*, ſaith *Albertus Magnus*, *Scilicet*, *Oſtiarius*, *Lector*, *Exorciſta*, *Acolytus*, *Subdiaconus*, *Diaconus*, *& Presbyter*, *qui omnium ordinum eſt perfectiſſimus & terminus aliorum*: There are ſeven Orders, ſaith he, to wit, the *Doorkepeer*, the *Reader*, the *Exorciſt*, the *Candle-bearer*, the *Sub-deacon*, the *Deacon*, and the *Prieſt*, which is the moſt perfect of all, and the end of the others. And of this laſt only we ſhall here Treat.

Albert. Mag. Lib. Theolog. c. 35.

That we may with more perſpicuity penetrate the difference between the preſent Doctrine and Practice of the Church of *Rome*, and the Cuſtome of all the Chriſtian World, from *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* time, by comparing the one with the other, I deem'd it expedient here to give the Reader a view of the Antient Rituals of

of the *Latines*, the *Greeks*, the *Syrians*, *Maronites*, *Neſtorians*, *Jacobites*, *Eutichians*, the *Copticks*, the *Ægyptians* and the *Æthiopians*, which were diſperſt all the Eaſt over as far as *China*, and incorporated among the *Tartars*, the *Perſians*, the *Turks*, &c. and the *Neſtorians* alone had among them above a Thouſand Biſhops. And firſt we'll begin with the *Latines*.

A Pontifical written Eleven hundred years ſince for the Ordination of Prieſts *according to the* Latines.

This *Ritual* was Written in a moſt ſplendid and magnificent Character, which from *France* was conveyed to *Stockholme* in *Sweathland*, and thence, by a great price, redeemed, by *Chriſtina* Queen of that Kingdom, after ſhe had abandoned her Regal Government, as *Morinus* relates who ſaw it, and Tranſcrib'd it into *Latine*; which I ſhall here ſet down word for word, to avoid Repetition, when the ſame occurs in other *Rituals*.

Allocutio ad Populum in Ordinatione Presbyteri.

QUoniam dilectiſſimi Fratres, Rectori navis, & navigio deferendis eadem eſt vel ſecuritatis ratio, vel timoris, communis eorum debet eſſe ſententia, quorum cauſa communis exiſtit; nec fruſtra à Patribus, reminiſcimur inſtitutum, ut de electione eorum, qui ad regimen altaris adhibendi ſunt, conſulatur.

Quia

Quia de actu & converſatione præſenti, quod nonnunquam ignoratur à pluribus, ſcitur à paucis. Et neceſſe eſt ut facilius quis obedientiam exhibeat Ordinato, cui adſenſum præbuerit Ordinando. Fratris noſtri, & compresbyteri converſatio quantum noſſe mihi videor, probata, ac Deo placita eſt, & digna, ut arbitror, Eccleſiaſtici honoris augmento. Sed ne unum fortaſſe, vel paucos, aut decipiat aſſenſio, aut fallat affectio, ſententia eſt expectanda multorum. Itaque quid de ejus actibus, aut moribus noveritis, quid de meritis ſentiatis, Deo teſte conſulemus. Debet hanc fidem habere caritas veſtra, quam ſecundum præceptum Evangelii, & Deo exhibere debetis, & proximo, ut huic teſtimonium Sacerdoti, magis pro merito, quam pro affectione, aliquid tribuatis. Et qui devotionem omnium expectamus, intelligere tacentes non poſſumus. Scimus tamen quod eſt acceptabilius Deo, aderit per Spiritum Sanctum conſenſus unus omnium animorum, & ideo electionem veſtram debetis voce publica profiteri. Per Dominum, &c.

Oratio ad Presbiteros Ordinandos.

Oremus dilectiſſimi Deum Patrem omnipotentem, ut ſuper hunc famulum ſuum, quem ad Presbiterii munus elegit, cœleſtia dona multiplicet, & quæ ejus dignatione ſuſcipiunt, ejus exequantur auxilio, per Dominum, &c.

Item alia.

Exaudi nos Deus ſalutaris Noſter, ut ſuper hunc famulum tuum benedictionem Spiritus ſancti, & gratiæ ſacerdotalis effunde virtutem, ut quem tuæ pietatis ſuſpectibus offerimus conſecrandum, perpetua muneris tui largitate perſequaris. Per Dominum, &c.

Conſecratio.

Domine ſancte Pater, omnipotens æterne Deus, honorum omnium dignitatum, quæ tibi militant diſtributor, per quem cuncta firmantur amplificatis ſemper in melius naturæ rationalis incrementis, per ordinem congrua ratione diſpoſitum, unde Sacerdotalis gradus, & officia Levitarum, Sacramentis myſticis inſtituta creverunt

creverunt, ut cum Pontifices ſummos regendis Populis præfeciſſes, ad eorum ſocietatis, & operis adjumentum, ſequentes ordines viros, & ſecundæ dignitatis elegeris; ſic in eremo per 70 virorum prudentium mentis Moyſi Spiritum propagaſti, quibus ille adjutoribus uſus in populo, innumeras multitudines facile gubernavit. Sic & Eleazaro, & Ithamar filiis Aaron Paternæ plenitudinis abundantiam transfudiſti, & ad hoſtias ſalutares & frequentiores Officii Sacramenta ſufficeret meritum Sacerdotum. Hac providentia Domine, Apoſtolis filii tui, Doctores fidei comites addidiſti, quibus illi orbem totum ſecundis prædicatoribus impleverunt. Quapropter infirmitati quoque noſtræ, Domine, quæſumus, hæc adjumenta largire, qui quanto magis fragiliores ſumus, tanto his pluries indigemus. Da quæſumus omnipotens Pater in hoc famulo tuo illo Presbiterii dignitatem: innova in viſceribus ejus Spiritum ſanctitatis, acceptum à te Deus ſecundi meriti munus obtineat, cenſuramque morum, exemplo ſuæ converſationis inſinuet. Sit providens cooperator ordinis noſtri, eluceat in eo totius forma juſtitiæ, ut bonam rationem diſpenſationis ſibi creditæ redditurus, æternæ beatitudinis præmia conſequatur.

Conſummatio Presbyteri.

Sit nobis fratres communis oratio, ut his qui in adjutorium, & utilitatem veſtræ ſalutis eligetur, Presbiteratus benedictionem, Divini indulgentia muneris conſequatur, & Sancti Spiritus Sacerdotalia dona privilegio virtutum, ne impar loco deprehendatur obtineat per ſuum, per Dominum, &c.

Item Benedictio.

Sanctificationem omnium Autor, cujus vera conſecratio plena benedictio eſt. Tu Domine ſuper hunc famulum ill. quem Presbyterii honori dedicamus, manum tuæ benedictionis eum infunde, ut gravitate actuum & cenſura vivendi, probet ſe eſſe ſeniorem, his inſtitutus diſciplinis quas Tito, & Timotheo Paulus expoſuit, ut in lege tua die ac nocte omnipotens, meditans, quod elegerit credat; quod crediderit doceat; quod docuerit meditetur, juſtitiam, conſtantiam, miſericordiam, fortitudinem in ſe oſtendat, exemplum probet, admonitionem confirmet, ut purum atque immaculatum miniſterii tui donum cuſtodiat, & per obſequium plebis tuæ,

corpus

corpus & ſanguinem Filii tui immaculata benedictione transformet, & inviolabili caritate in virum perfectum in menſuram ætatis planitudinis Chriſti in die juſtitiæ æterni judicii, conſcientia pura, fide plena, Spirito Sancto plenus perſolvat. Per Dominum, &c.

Conſecratio Manus.

Conſecrentur manus iſtæ, & ſanctificentur per iſtam unctionem, & noſtram benedictionem, ut quæcunque benedixerint, benedicta ſint, & quæcunque ſanctificaverint ſanctificentur. Per Dominum, &c.

Item alia.

Unguantur manus iſtæ de oleo Sanctificato, & Chriſmate Sanctificationis, ſicut unxit Samuel David *in Regem, & Prophetam, ita unguantur, & conſummentur, in nomine Dei Patris, & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, facientes imaginem Sanctæ Crucis Salvatoris Domini Noſtri* J. Chriſti, *qui nos à morte redemit, & ad regna cœlorum perduxit. Exaudi nos pie pater omnipotens æterne Deus, & præſta quod te rogamus & oramus. Per Dominum*, &c.

The

The Speech to the People at the Ordination of a Prieſt.

BEcauſe, moſt dearly beloved Brethren, the Pilot and Paſſengers are equally concerned in their ſecurity, or fear, their opinion ought to be common, ſeeing their cauſe is common: neither in vain do we remember, that it was ordained by the Fathers, That we ought to conſult about the Election of thoſe, that are to be advanced to the Regiment of the Altar. Becauſe few men know, what moſt are ignorant of, a Man's actions and preſent converſation. And it is neceſſary that every one will willingly obey him Ordain'd, to whoſe Ordination he gave his Aſſent: The Converſation of our Brother and fellow Prieſt, as far as I do know, is approved and pleaſing to God, worthy, as I Judge, of this Augmentation of Eccleſiaſtical honour. But leſt perhaps one or a few may be deceived by conſent, or deluded by affection, we muſt wait for the opinion of many; therefore God being witneſs, let us conſider what ye know of his

Manners

Manners and Actions, what ye think of his deſerts. Your Charity ought to have this beliefe, which according to the *Goſpel*, ye owe to God and your Neighbour, that ye grant your Teſtimony to this Prieſt, rather for Deſert than Affection; and we, who expect your Pious Vote, cannot underſtand thoſe that are ſilent: Yet we know it to be more acceptable to God, that by the *Holy Ghoſt* there ſhall be an unanimous conſent of all, and therefore ye ought to profeſs your Election by a Publick Voice. *Per Dominum*, &c.

The Prayer at the Ordination of Prieſts.

"Moſt dearly Beloved, Let us pray "God the Father Omnipotent, That "he would multiply his heavenly guifts "upon this his Servant, whom he hath "choſen to the Office of a Prieſt, and "what Guifts they receive by his favor "they may execute by his help. *Per* "*Dom.* &c.

Another

Another.

"Hear us God our Saviour, and "pour out the Bleſſing of thy Holy "Spirit, and Virtue of Sacerdotal grace "upon this thy ſervant, and that whom "we offer to be Conſecrated to the "ſight of thy Piety, thou mayſt aſſiſt "with the perpetual bounty of thy "Guiſt. *Per Dominum*, &c.

The Conſecration.

"O Lord Holy Father, Omnipotent "Eternal God, the diſtributor of all ho-"nours and dignities to thoſe who fight "for thee, by whom all things are con-"firmed, always enlarging the encreaſe "of reaſonable nature for the better, "through order diſpoſed by an agreea-"ble reaſon, whence the degree of "Prieſthood, and Office of Levites, "inſtituted by Myſtical Sacraments, "encreaſed; that, ſeeing thou haſt pla-"ced Archbiſhops to rule thy people, "that thou wouldſt chuſe Men of ſub-"ſequent Order, and of a ſecond Dig-"nity, for the aſſiſtance of their Society "and Labour; So in the Wilderneſs,

"by

"by the prudence of 70 Men propa-
"gated the Spirit of *Moyſes*, who uſing
"thoſe Aſſiſtants among the People,
"he eaſily Governed innumerable mul-
"titudes; and likewiſe thou didſt
"transfuſe into *Eleazar* and *Ithamar*,
"the ſons of *Aaron*, the abundance of
"their Fathers fulneſs; and that the
"Merit of Prieſts ſhould ſuffice for ſa-
"ving Sacrifices and Sacraments of a
"more frequent Office. O Lord, by
"this Providence, thou haſt added to
"the Apoſtles of thy Son, Doctors of
"our Faith, their Companions, where-
"with they filled the whole World
"with proſperous Preachers. Where-
"fore, Lord, we beſeech thee, beſtow
"ſuch Aſſiſtance on our infirmity, who
"by how much we are more frail, by
"ſo much the more we ſtand in need
"thereof. Give, we beſeech thee, Om-
"nipotent Father, that Dignity of
"Prieſthood in this thy ſervant; re-
"new in his bowels the Spirit of that
"Holineſs, let him obtain the Guift of
"the Second Merit received from
"thee, O God, and let him inſinuate
"a Cenſure of his Manners by the Ex-
"ample of his Converſation, let him
"be a provident cooperator of our
"Order,

"Order, let the form of all Juſtice "ſhine forth from him, that when he "ſhall give a good account of his Stew- "ardſhip committed to him, he may at- "tain the rewards of Eternal Bliſs.

The Conſummation of the Prieſt.

"Brethren, Let it be our common "Prayer, that he who ſhall be elected "for the help and benefit of your Sal- "vation, may, by the Indulgence of "Gods guift, obtain the Benediction "of Prieſthood, and by the Priviledge "of his Virtues, leſt he be found un- "meet for his place, he may obtain by "his own, the Sacerdotal Guifts of "the Holy Spirit. *Per Dominum*, "&c.

The

The Benediction.

"O the Author of all Sanctification,
"whoſe true Conſecration is a plenary
"Benediction; Thou, O Lord, upon
"this thy Servant, whom we Dedicate
"to the honor of Prieſthood, pour out
"the hand of thy Bleſſing, that by the
"gravity of his actions, and cenſure of
"living, he approve himſelf an Elder,
"inſtructed in the Diſcipline, which
"*Paul* expounded to *Titus* and *Timo-*
"*thy*, that, O Omnipotent God, day
"and night meditating in thy Law, he
"may believe what he hath choſen,
"what he hath Believed he may
"Teach, what he hath Taught he
"may Meditate; he may ſhew forth in
"himſelf Juſtice, Conſtancy, Mercy and
"Fortitude, may approve his Example,
"may confirm his Admonition, that
"he may preſerve the Guift of thy Mi-
"niſtry pure and undefiled, and may
"transforme, by his Immaculate Bene-
"diction, the Body and Blood of thy
"Son, through the obedience of thy
"People: that as a perfect Man, with
"inviolable Charity to the meaſure of
"age,

"age, of the fulneſs of *Chriſt*, in the "day of the Juſtice of Eternal Judg- "ment, he may acquit himſelf with a "pure Conſcience, with a full Faith, "being filled with the *Holy Ghoſt*. *Per* "*Dominum*, &c.

Conſecration of the Hand.

"Let theſe Hands be Conſecrated "and Sanctified by this Unction, and "our Benediction, that whatever they "Bleſs may be Bleſſed, and whatever "they Sanctifie may be Sanctified. *Per* "*Dominum*, &c.

Another.

"Let theſe Hands be Anointed with "this Holy Oyle, and Chriſme of San- "ctification, as *Samuel* Anointed *Da-* "*vid* for a King and a Prophet, ſo let "them be Anointed and Compleated "in the Name of *God the Father*, the "*Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, making the "Sign of the Croſs of the *Lord* our *Sa-* "*viour Jeſus Chriſt*, who Redeemed us "from Death, and brings us to the "Kingdom of Heaven. Hear us, Pious "*Father*,

"*Father*, Omnipotent Eternal God, and "perform what we entreat and pray of "thee. *Per Dominum*, &c.

A Ritual taken out of the Fourth Council of *Carthage*.

WHere theſe words are contained: *Presbyter cum Ordinatur, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri qui preſentes ſunt, manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius teneant.*

Another taken out of the Fourth Council of Carthage.

WHen a Prieſt is Ordained, the Biſhop Bleſſing him, and holding his hand upon his head, likewiſe all the Prieſts that are preſent, ſhall lay their hands upon his head, by the hand of the Biſhop.

The Ritual of *Gelatius* Pope, Written 900 years ſince.

ORdo qualiter Romana ſedis Apoſtolicæ Eccleſia, Presbyteri, Diaconi vel Subdiaconi eligendi ſunt. Menſis primi, quarti, ſeptimi, & decimi Sabbatorum die in duodecim lectiones ad Sanctum Petrum ubi Miſſæ celebrantur. Poſtquam antiphonam ad introitum dixerint, data oratione, adnuntiat Pontifex in Populo dicens: Auxiliante Domino Deo, & ſalvatore noſtro Jeſu Chriſto. *Iterum dicit: Auxiliante Domino Deo, & ſalvatore noſtro* Jeſu Chriſto, *eligimus in ordine Diaconi, ſive Presbyteri illum Diaconum ſive Subdiaconum, de titulo illo. Si quis autem habet aliquid contra hos viros, pro Deo & propter Deum cum fiducia exeat, & dicat: verumtamen memor ſit communionis ſuæ. Et poſt modicum intervallum mox incipiunt omnes Kyrie eleiſon, cum Lætania; hac expleta, aſcendunt ipſi electi ad ſedem Pontificis, & benedicit eos à quo vocati ſunt, & deſcendunt. Stant in ordines ſuos benedictione percepta.*

Sequitur oratio de bened. require ipſam in quarto aut decimo menſe.

The

The Ritual of Gelatius the Pope, Written 900 years ſince.

THe Order how Prieſts, Deacons, Subdeacons, are to be choſen in the *Roman* Church of the See Apoſtolick. On the Sabbath of the Firſt, Fourth, Seventh, and Tenth Month, at the 12 *Leſſons* at St. *Peters* Church, where *Maſſes* are celebrated. After they have ſaid the *Antiphon* to the *Introitus*, after Prayer, let the Biſhop declare among the People, ſaying, *Our Lord God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt aſſiſting us.* Again, he ſayes, *Our Lord God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt aſſiſting, We chuſe into the Order of Deacon, or Prieſt, that Deacon, or Subdeacon of that Title. If any one have any thing againſt theſe Men, for Gods ſake let him come forth with confidence and ſpeak: yet let him be mindful of his Communion.* And after a ſmall interval, all forthwith begin *Kyrie Eleiſon*, with the *Letany:* this compleated, the Perſons choſen ſtep up to the Biſhops Seat, and he Bleſſes them from whom they are called, and they go down. They ſtand in their Orders the Bleſſing being received.

Then follows a *Prayer* of Benediction, as in the Fourth, or the Tenth Month. What follows is all as above.

Ad Ordinandos Presbyteros,

Oremus dilectiſſimi, &c. the ſame in ſubſtance as above. Then follows *Conſecratio. Conſummatio Presbyteri. Item Benedictio.* All the ſame as above.

A Ritual of above 800 years ſtanding.

This Ritual and the next were taken out of a Written Book kept in the Pontifical Chamber of the *Vatican*, which the Pope uſed when he Officiated. It may be ſeen in the Fifth *Tome* of St. *Gregory*.

POſtquam antiphonam ad introitum dixerint, data oratione, venit Archidiaconus & offert eum qui ordinandus eſt, Pontifici, ita dicens: Poſtulat ſancta mater Eccleſia Catholica, ut hunc præſentem diaconum ad onus Presbyterii ordinetis. Interrogat Epiſcopus: Scis illum dignum eſſe? Reſpondet offerens: quantum

tum humana fragilitas noſſe ſinit; & ſcio, & teſtificor ipſum dignum eſſe ad hujus onus officii, &c. *Tunc annnnciat Pontifex Populo: Auxiliante Domino Deo*, &c. the ſame as in the Ritual of *Gelatius*, then follows. *Oratio ad Presbyteros Ordinandos Conſecratio. Hic veſtis & caſulam: Benedictio Patris & filii & Spiritus Sancti, deſcendat ſuper te, ut ſis benedictus in ordine ſacerdotali; & offeras placabiles hoſtias pro peccatis, atque offenſionibus populi omnipotenti Deo, cui ſit honor & gloria in ſecula ſeculorum.* Then *Conſecratio manus*; as above, and nothing elſe.

A Ritual of above 800 *years ſtanding.*

AFter they ſhall have ſaid the *Antiphon* to the *Introitus*, after Prayer, comes the Archdeacon, and preſents him who is to be Ordained, to the Biſhop, ſaying thus; *The Holy Mother, the Catholick Church requires, that ye Ordain this Deacon here preſent to the charge of Prieſthood.* The Biſhop Asks, *Do you know him worthy?* The Archdeacon Anſwers; *So far as humane frailty is ſuffered to know, I both know and teſtifie him to be worthy to undergo*

the burden of this Office. Then let the Biſhop ſay to the People, *Auxiliante Domino Deo*, &c. *By the help of the Lord God*, &c. Then the Prayer and Conſecration, the Prieſtly Veſtment, *&c. The Bleſſing of the* Father, Son, *and* Holy Ghoſt *deſcend upon thee, that thou mayſt be bleſt in the* Prieſthood, *and mayſt offer acceptable Sacrifices for ſins and offences of the people to Allmighty God, to whom be Honor and Glory for ever and ever.*

A Ritual taken out of a very antient Manuſcript of the Vatican.

This contains nothing different from the former, but only a word or two here and there changed, without any eſſential difference.

There are Three other *Rituals*, the one belonging to *Corbie* in *France*, another is a *Ritual* that was uſed in *England* 800 years ſince, and now belongs to the Church of *Roane*. The Third belongs to the Church of *Remes*, and was Written about 800 years ſince, which all agree with that above.

There

There is another *Ritual* 700 years old: This did belong to one *Conſtantinus Caetanus*, Abbot of a Monaſtery near *Rome*, which contains all that the former *Rituals* have, but is more ample, and adds more Ceremonies and Prayers, not any way belonging to the Eſſentials of Prieſthood, except that which is ſpecified towards the end; for the Biſhop having recited the Conſecration, he totally omits that which is contained under the Title: *Conſummatio Presbyteri*, as in the firſt *Ritual*; then he puts the Stole on the right ſhoulder of him that is to be Ordained, ſaying, *Accipe jugum Dei, jugum enim ejus ſuave eſt, & onus ejus leve*; Receive the yoke of God, for his yoke is ſweet and his burthen light. Then he puts on his Caſula, or Veſtment, ſaying, *Stola innocentiæ induat te Dominus:* God put thee on the Stole of Innocence. Then follows the Benediction: *Deus Sanctificationum*, &c. as in the firſt *Ritual*; which done, *Capiens oleum facit crucem ſuper manus ambas, ita dicens: Conſecrare & ſanctiſicare digneris Domine manus iſtas, per iſtam unctionem, ut quæcunque conſecraverint, conſecrentur, & quæcunque benedixerint benedicantur*

& ſanctificentur in nomine Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti.

Hoc facto, accipiat patenam cum oblatis, & calicem cum vino dicat Accipe poteſtatem, offerre ſacrificium Deo, Miſſamque celebrare, tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis in nomine Domini.

Benedictio.

Benedictio Dei Patris, & filii, & Spiritus Sancti deſcendet ſuper vos ut ſitis benedicti in ordine Sacerdotali, & offeratis placabiles hoſtias pro peccatis atque offenſionibus populi omnipotenti Deo, cui eſt honor & gloria per omnia.

Taking the Oyle, he makes a Croſs upon both his hands, ſaying thus; "O "Lord, vouchſafe to Conſecrate and "Sanctifie theſe hands by this Unction, "that whatever they ſhall Conſecrate "may be conſecrated, and whatever "they ſhall bleſs, may be bleſſed in the "Name of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt.*

This being performed, let him take the Paten with the Offerings, and the Calice with the Wine, let him ſay, "Receive the Power to offer Sacrifice "to God, and to ſay Maſs, both for the "Living

"Living and the Dead, in the Name of "our Lord, *&c.*

The Benediction.

"Let the Bleſſing of God the *Father*, "and of the *Son*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt* "deſcend upon ye; may ye be bleſſed "in the Order of Prieſthood, and may ye "offer Attoning Sacrifices for the Sins "and offences of the People to Almigh- "ty God; To whom be Honor and Glo- "ry, *&c.*

This is the firſt *Ritual* that I can find, which contains the touching of the Chalice with Wine, and the Pattene with an Hoaſt, with this Form, *Accipe poteſtatem*, &c. as above, which the Church of *Rome* hath ever ſince retained to this day.

Another *Ritual* belonging to the Church of *Mens*, of 450 years ſtanding, contains all that the former hath: But in the Margin, it is written, that the Biſhop ſaith to them that are Ordained, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*; *quorum remiſeritis peccata, remittuntur eis, & quorum retinueritis retenta ſunt*, &c. *poſt ſumptionem corporis & Sanguinis Jeſu Chriſti, antequam*

antequam dicatur poſtcommunio, tunc Epiſcopus trahat unicuique caſulam deorſum per ſcapulas, oſculans eum, & dicens: Pax Domini ſit ſemper tecum.

"Receive the *Holy Ghoſt*; whoſe "ſins ye remit, are remitted, and whoſe "ſins ye retain, are retained. And after the receiving the Body and Blood of *Jeſus Chriſt*, before the ſaying of the Poſt-Communion, let the Biſhop let down the Veſtment from their ſhoulders, kiſſing each of them, and ſaying, "Let the Peace of our Lord be always "with you.

This addition is all the difference between this and the laſt *Ritual*; and in the peruſal of theſe, and ſeveral other *Rituals*, I never met with any power to Remit and Retain ſins, communicated to the Ordained by ſuch plain and expreſs words, after they had received the power of *Prieſthood*. Yet by the Cuſtom of ſome Churches, this form *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum quorum*, &c. is uſed in the beginning of the Ordination of Prieſts, and accompanyeth the Impoſition of hands; But the preſent Practice of the Church of *Rome* is to give this power about the end of the *Maſs*,

Maſs, by the Impoſition of Hands, as the Matter; and the words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum*, &c. as the Form. And becauſe the Modern *Rituals* of the *Latines* contain nothing of moment more, then what the *Roman Pontifical* expreſſeth, I ſhall therefore wave them, leſt it might prove tedious to the *Reader*.

SECT. III.

SECT. III.

A briefe Account of the Rituals *of the* Greeks, Maronites, *&c.*

WE begin with the *Greeks*, and becauſe the Antient *Rituals* have no more in them then what is contained in thoſe of a later date: I ſhall omit the former, for after them, to tranſcribe the more modern Pontificals, were, *actum agere*, to do the ſame thing twice.

A *Greek Ritual*, Written 800 years ſince, kept in the Liberary of Cardinal *Franciſcus Barbarinus*.

Ordinatio Presbyteri.

Poſtquam allata ſunt Sancta dona, & in ſacra menſa repoſita ſunt, & completus eſt Sanctus Hymnus myſticus Cherubicus, charta conſueta traditur Archiepiſcopo in qua ſcriptum eſt: Divina gratia quæ ſemper infirma curat, & deficientia complet, promovet hunc N. Deo amabilem Diaconum in Presbyterum. Eaque lecta

lecta ita ut omnes audiant, qui ordinandus eſt adducitur, eoque genu flectente, tria crucis ſigna facit ſuper caput ejus, habenſque manum ei impoſitam, hæc precatur.

Deus qui es principii & finis expers, qui omni creatura longè es antiquior; quique denominatione Presbyteri eos honoraſti, qui digni judicati ſunt, in eo gradu ſancte adminiſtrare verbum veritatis tuæ, Ipſe omnium Domine, complaceat tibi hunc, quam à me propter politiam irreprehenſibilem, modumque agendi inculpatum, & fidem conſtantem promoveri probaſti, magnam illam gratiam Sancti Spiritus tui ſuſcipere. Perfectum redda ſervum tuum, ut tibi in omnibus placeat & pro data ſibi à providente virtute tua, magno illo ſacerdotali honore, dignè ſeſe gerat & converſetur: quia tua eſt potentia tuum eſt regnum, & virtus, &c.

Tum facit Presbyterorum unus Diaconi precem in hunc modum. In pace Dominum deprecemur: Pro ſuprema pace ac ſalute: Pro pace univerſi mundi. Pro Archiepiſcopo noſtro N. ipſius ſacerdotio, auxilio, perſeverantia, pace, ac ſalute, & operibus manuum ejus Dominum deprecemur.

Pro

Pro eo qui nunc promovetur Presbytero & ſalute ipſius Dominum deprecemur. Ut clemens & hominum amans Deus, immaculatum, & irreprehenſibile, largiatur illi Sacerdotium deprecemur.

Pro piiſſimo, & à Deo cuſtodito Imperatore Noſtro, &c. *Et cum à Presbytero hæc habetur oratio, Archiepiſcopus conſimiliter manum tenens ſuper caput illius qui ordinatur ſic precatur.*

Deus qui potens es in virtute, cujus prudentiam ſcrutari nemo poteſt, qui ſupra omnes hominum filios, admirabilis es in Conſiliis, Ipſe Domine, & hunc qui Presbyterii gradum ſubire, & adipiſci voluiſti, reple dono Sancti tui Spiritus, ut dignus ſit ſine crimine & querela, aſſiſtere Altari tuo, prædicare Evangelium ſalutis tuæ, ſanctè adminiſtrare verbum veritatis tuæ, offerre tibi dona & ſacrificia ſpiritualia, renovare populum tuum per lavacrum regenerationis; ut ipſe occurrens in ſecundo adventu Magni Dei, & ſalvatoris noſtri Jeſu Chriſti unigeniti filii tui, adminiſtrationis propriis gradus & officii, bene geſti, ſecundum multitudinem bonitatis tuæ, mercedem recipiat. Elata voce: *quia benedictum eſt & glorificatum magnum, & maxime honorabile nomen tuum,* &c. *Amen*

Amen dicto, orarii, ſive Stolæ partem quæ poſterius eſt, in partem anteriorem deducit, ipſumque phelonio inducit, & oſculo ei dato, cum cæteris Presbyteris ſiſtit. Tunc ait Diaconus: perficiamus preces noſtras Domino. Poſtquam autem levatum eſt velum à Sanctis donis & populus dixerit, dignum & juſtum eſt, tunc tradit Archiepiſcopus Presbytero ordinato in manus panem unum è diſco, tenentemque manibus panem ſibi traditum, & imponentem caput ſupra ipſum inclinat ſupra ſacram menſam, ſicque manet donec dicatur, Sancta Sanctis. Tunc ordinatus reſtituit Archiepiſcopo panem, omniumque Presbyterorum primus communicat, & ab Ordinatore Sancti ſanguinis ſit particeps.

After the Sacred Myſteries are brought, and expoſed upon the Holy Table, and the Holy Myſtical Cherubical Hymne is compleated; the accuſtomed Paper is delivered to the Archbiſhop, wherein it is thus written: "The Divine Grace, that always cures "that which is infirm, and ſupplies de- "fects, promotes this Deacon N. belo- "ved of God, to Prieſthood: which being Read, ſo as all may hear it, he that

that is to be Ordained is brought forth, and while he is kneeling, the Biſhop makes three ſigns of the Croſs upon his head, and having his hand upon him, Prayes thus:

"O God, who art without beginning "or end, who in Antiquity far exceed- "eſt all Creatures, and who haſt ho- "nored thoſe with the Title of Prieſt- "hood, who are deemed worthy in that "quality to be holy Adminiſtrators of "the Word of thy Truth. Thou Lord "of all things, vouchſafe to confer the "powerful Grace of thy Holy Spirit "upon him, whoſe promotion, by me, "thou haſt approved of, by reaſon of "his irreprehenſible policy, his un- "blameable actions, and his conſtant "Faith. Render thy ſervant perfect, "that he may pleaſe thee in all things, "And according to the guifts iſſuing "from thy provident vertue, let him, by "his Converſation demeane himſelf "worthily of that great honor of Prieſt- "hood, becauſe thine is the Power, thine "is the Kingdom, and Virtue, *&c.*

Then one of the Prieſts makes the Deacons Prayer in this manner, "Let "us pray the Lord in peace; for ſu-

"preme

" preme peace and safety; for the peace " of the whole World; for our Arch- " bishop *N.* for his Priesthood, his help, " his perseverance, peace and safety, and " for the works of his hands let us pray " the Lord.

" For him that is now promoted to " Priesthood, and for his safety let us " pray the Lord, that God, who is cle- " ment and a lover of Mankind, will " confer unto him an immaculate and " irreprehensible Priesthood.

" For our most Pious Emperor, pro- " tected by God, *&c.* And when the Priest hath accomplished this Prayer, The Archbishop likewise holding his hand upon the head of him that is to be Ordained, Prays thus:

" O God, who art powerful in ver- " tue, whose prudence no Man can pe- " netrate, who above all the sons of " Men art admirable in thy counsels. " Thou, O Lord, repleniſh with the gift " of thy Holy Spirit this Person whom " thou wouldest have obtain, and per- " form the Functions of Priesthood, that " without crime and complaint he may " assist at thy Altar, Preach the Gospel " of thy Salvation, holily Administer

"the Word of thy Truth, Offer to thee "Spiritual Guifts and Sacrifices, renew "thy People by the fountain of Rege- "neration; that he occurring in the "ſecond coming of the Grace of God, "and our Saviour *Jeſus Chriſt*, thy only "begotten Son, according to the multi- "tude of thy goodneſs, may receive the "reward of his proper Adminiſtration, "degree, and office well performed.

And then with a cleer voice: "Be- "cauſe thy Grace and moſt honorable "Name is Bleſſed and Glorified.

Then having ſaid, *Amen*, he takes that part of the Stole that was behind, and placeth it before, and put him on a Caſula (that is, a Prieſtly Veſtment) and giving him a Kiſs, placeth him among the other Prieſts. Then the Deacon ſays, "Let us compleat our Pray- "ers to the Lord. And after the Holy "Myſteries are unvayled, and the Peo- ple have ſaid, "It is worthy and juſt: Then the Archbiſhop gives into the hands of the Ordained Prieſt, one piece of Bread from the Patene, and holding the Bread delivered to him in his hands, and holding his head over it, inclines upon

upon the Holy Table, and ſo he remains untill the Holy to Holies be ſaid. Then the Ordained reſtores to the Archbiſhop the Bread, and receives the Communion before all the other Prieſts, and by the Ordainer is made partaker of the Holy Blood.

Another Greek *Ritual of about* 700 *years ſtanding.*

This in all things agrees with the former, only in the end it is added, *Deinde alios communicat, orationemque poſt ambonem recitat, & ſeptem diebus Miſſam celebrat.* That is, then he Communicates others, and recites the Prayer ſtanding behind the Biſhops Seate, and ſeven days together celebrates Maſs.

Another Greek Ritual, *or* Liturgy *of about* 300 *years ſtanding, belonging to the French Kings Library, differs nothing from the former.*

Another *Greek Ritual* of a later date, which only differs from the former in this, that when they pray for the Biſhop, for him that is to be Ordained, for the Emperor, in this *Ritual* it is added: *Pro hac urbe, pro liberatione noſtra ab omni tribulatione. Auxiliare, ſerva, miſerere, cuſtodi nos, intercedente ſanctiſſima immaculata, & ſuper omnia benedicta Domina Noſtra Dei genetrice & ſemper Virgine.*

"For this City, for our deliverance "from all Tribulation, preſerve, have "Mercy and keep us, by the Interceſſi-"on of the Moſt Holy Immaculate, and "above all things bleſſed, our Lady "Mother of God, and ever Virgin.

In this *Liturgy* it is alſo commanded, that he who is to be Ordained Prieſt be 30 years of age.

Another

Another Greek Ritual *kept in the* Vatican.

In this there is only this difference: That *Poſt repoſita dona*, &c. to theſe words is annexed, *Ordinandus à Primo Presbytero ducitur ad ſanctam menſam, traditque chartophylax Epiſcopo chartam ſcriptam, Poſtea proclamat Archiadiaconus, Attendamus.*

Tum Epiſcopus exaudientibus omnibus circumſtantibus, legit quæ in charta ſcripta ſunt, ſic dicens: Divina gratia, &c.

Et reſpondetur Kyrie Eleiſon; Ordinandus vero utrumque genu flectit ſuper altaris crepidinem. Quo facto, Epiſcopus ter ſigno crucis caput ejus ſignat, manumque ſuper eum tenens impoſitum precatur.

Deus qui es ſine principio & fine qui omnis creaturæ Rector es, & curator, &c.

He that is to be Ordained is led by the Chief Prieſt to the Holy Table, then the Keeper of the *Archivium* (which contains the Writings and Records) delivers to the Biſhop a Written Paper.

Afterwards the Archdeacon proclaims, "Let us attend.

Then the Biſhop, in the hearing of all the by-ſtanders, Reads all that is Written in the Paper, ſaying thus: "The Divine Grace, *&c.*

And it is anſwered, "Kyrie Eleiſon: And the Ordained kneels upon the ſtep of the Altar; which done, the Biſhop makes three ſigns of the Croſs upon his head, and holding his hand upon him, Prays.

"O God, who art without begin-"ning or end, who art the Governor "and Protector of all things, *&c.*

Another Greek Ritual *taken out of a later Manuſcript.*

This contains a Conſtitution of *Philumenus*, in theſe words; *Ego dilectus à Domino vobis Epiſcopis ſic conſtituo: Repoſitis ſupra menſam*, &c. *Et completo Hymno Cherubico, ſtat in ſolea ordinandus in Presbyterum, tum egredientes duo Diaconi ipſum ex utraque parte accipiunt, & deducunt uſque ad portas Sanctas, ibique eum dimittunt Diaconi, &*

excipiunt

excipiunt duo Presbyteri, primus & secundus, terque circumdant Sanctam mensam hymnum canentes: Sancti Martyres qui præclarè decertarunt. Tum sic incipit magna & elata voce is Presbyterorum, qui lingua est expeditiore.

Offertur Religiosissimus Diaconus N. frater noster ut ordinetur in Presbyterum Sanctissimæ Ecclesiæ N. &c. *Sciendum autem quod cum canunt Sancti Martyres,* &c. *Sedet Episcopus in parva sella ante sanctam mensam; illique gyrando, cum pervenerint ante Episcopi conspectum, inclinationem, reverentiæ causa, faciunt, ordinandusque genu Episcopi desuper pallium deosculatur. Postea surgit Episcopus, & ad ipsum accedit ordinandus, terque ab eo caput ipsius signatur: Deinde fronti Sanctæ Mensæ impositus, flectit quoque ambo genua & exclamante Diacono; Attendamus, Episcopus, imposita manu dextra super caput illius, statim exclamat dicens: Divina gratia, quæ infirma semper curat, & deficientia supplet, promovet hunc religiosissimum sacrum Diaconum in Presbyterum. Precemur igitur pro eo ut mittat super ipsum gratiam Sancti Spiritus. Dicto postea ter Kyrie eleison, iterum ipsum ter signat, manumque tenens ipsi impositam, Diacono dicente*

Dominum deprecemur, orat: Deus, qui es principii & finis expers, &c.

Exclamatione facta, dicit Protopapas voce demiſſiore, ita tamen ut qui præſentes ſunt reſpondere poſſint, hæc Diaconica. In pace Dominum deprecemur, &c. as above. *Amen dicto jubet eum ſurgere, & transfert orarii partem poſteriorem in anteriorem dextri lateris, dicens:* Dignus, *poſtea phelonio ipſum induens, exclamat iterum,* dignus, *idemque canunt ii qui ſunt in ſanctuario & cantores; & ſic oſculatus Epiſcopum & Presbyteros, abiens conſiſtit cum Presbyteris, & legit Contacion, ſed Diaconus in loco conſueto ſubſiſtit, dicitque: Compleamus orationem noſtram Domino,* &c. *Cum vero ſancta conſecrata fuerint, & dicturus eſt, ita ut fiant participantibus, accedit Ordinatus, eique ſanctum panem tradit Epiſcopus ſic dicens.*

Accipe hoc depoſitum, & illud cuſtodi uſque ad adventum Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, quia illud à te eſt repetiturus. Ipſe vero eo accepto, Pontificis manum oſculatur, & revertitur ad locum in quo prius ſteterat, manuſque ponit ſuper ſanctam menſam dicens apud ſe Kyrie Eleiſon, & Miſerere mei Deus. *Cum autem dicendum eſt Sancta Sanctis tum ordinatus*

ordinatus reddit Sanctum panem, & ab Epiſcopo primus communicatur. Dicit inſuper orationem poſt ambonem. In Engliſh thus:

I, beloved of the Lord, to you Biſhops give this Conſtitution, when the Sacred Myſteries are placed upon the Holy Table, *&c.* and the Cherubical Hymn being ended; let him that is to be ordained Prieſt ſtand in the floor, then let two Deacons go forth, and one of each ſide let them lead him to the Holy Gates, and there let the Deacons leave him, and then let two Prieſts receive him, the firſt and the ſecond, and let them go three times about the Holy Table, ſinging the Hymn: *Holy Martyrs who have glorioufly fought*, &c. Then let one of the Prieſts that can ſpeak beſt, with a high and a cleer voice ſo begin.

" Our

"Our Brother *N.* this moſt Religi-
"ous Deacon, is here offered to be or-
"dained Prieſt of the moſt Holy
"Church *N.* &c. but you muſt know, that when they Sing *the Holy Martyrs*, &c. the Biſhop ſits on a little ſeat before the Holy Table: and they in going round, when they come in ſight of the Biſhop, bow to him out of reverence; and he that is to be ordained kiſſeth the Biſhops Knee upon the Pall. Then the Biſhop riſeth, and he that is to be ordained comes to him, whoſe head is three times ſigned by the Biſhop with the ſign of the Croſs; then being placed at the Front of the Holy Table, he kneels down; and the Deacon pronouncing aloud, *Let us attend.* The Biſhop putting his right hand upon the Ordaineds head, pronounceth theſe words: *The Divine Grace which always cures that which is infirm, and ſupplies that which is deficient, promotes this moſt Religious holy Deacon to Prieſthood.* "Let us therefore Pray for him,
"that the Grace of the *Holy Ghoſt* may
"come upon him: and then *Kyrie Eleiſon* being three times repeated, the Biſhop again ſigns him three times,

and

and having his hand upon him, the Deacon ſaying, *Let us beſeech the Lord*, the Prayer is ſaid, *O God that art without beginning and end*, &c.

The Pronunciation being made, the choſen Prieſt, with a lowd voice, ſo notwithſtanding as they that are preſent may anſwer, Prays thus: *Let us beſeech the Lord in peace*, &c. as above, and *Amen* being ſaid, he commands him to riſe, and removes the hinder part of his Stole to the fore-part of his right ſide, ſaying, *worthy*: then putting on his Prieſtly Veſtment, with a loud voice ſaith again, *worthy*: and the ſame do they ſay that are in the Sanctuary, and the Singers, and Kiſſing the Biſhop and the Prieſts, placeth himſelf among the Prieſts, reads the uſual Leſſon. But the Deacon remains in his uſual place, and ſays, *Let us compleat our Prayer to the Lord*, &c. But when the Holies are Conſecrated, and he is to ſay that all is ready for the partakers: He that is ordained approacheth, and the Biſhop giving him the Holy Bread, ſaying thus:

"Receive

"Receive this Pledge, and keep it "till the coming of our Lord *Jeſus* "*Chriſt*, becauſe he will require it of "thee; he receiving it, Kiſſeth the Biſhops hands, and returns to his former place, and puts his hands upon the Holy Table, ſaying to himſelf, *Kyrie Eleiſon*, and, *Have Mercy upon me O God.* But when the *Holy to Holies* is to be ſaid, then the ordained reſtores the Holy Bread, and is firſt communicated by the Biſhop, and moreover ſayes the Prayer ſtanding behind the Biſhops Seat.

The

The Order of conferring Prieſthood by the *Syrian Maronites*, as followeth.

THe *Maronites*, before their Reconciliation, were eſteemed Hereticks, as holding but one Will, and one kind of operation in *Chriſt*, which was the Hereſie of the *Monothelites*. Their *Ritual* for Prieſthood runs thus:

Primum venit ille quem elegit gratia, & utrumque genu flectit, manus habens ante ſe junctas, benediciturque ab Epiſcopo dicens: benedic Domine, tum Epiſcopus ſignat eum cruce inter oculos, &c. *Interea Archidiaconus thus offert dicitque benedic Domine: ſtemus omnes pulchrè in oratione & reliqua. Iterum atque iterum continuo & omni tempore Domino ſupplicemus: Domine pro redemptione, auxilio, ope, & remiſſione hujus ſervi tui, N. qui hic adſtat, & impoſitionem manus Divinæ accipit. Dona ei Domine gradum in Eccleſia, & ſacerdotium perfectum,* &c. *Oremus igitur, & precemur, & ſupplicemus, & clamemus, dicamuſque tribus vicibus Kyrie*

rie Eleiſon. Epiſcopus precatur, & dicitur, Sanctificaſti Deus, *& Symbolum. Interea Archidiaconus ducit eum manu dextra & dicit: Offerimus Sanctitati tuæ, O Pater ſancte, & electe Dei Domine N. Epiſcope, hunc Dei amantem qui hic adſtat, ut impoſitionem manus Divinæ accipiat, ex ordine Diaconi ad ordinem Presbyteratus ſuper altare Sanctum Eccleſiæ Sanctæ Sancti Domini N. civitatis benedictæ, & amantis Chriſti N. Eſt autem ſubjectus beatitati veſtræ, Pro eo clamemus & dicamus tribus vicibus*: Kyrie Eleiſon. *Epiſcopus precatur:* Divina gratia quæ ſemper infirma curat, & deficientia ſupplet promovet hunc religioſiſſimum ſacrum Diaconum, in Presbyterum. *Diaconus in pace Domino ſupplicemus. Epiſcopus precatur, Diaconus proclamat iſtud Domini Ephrem. Stemus omnes in oratione coram eo qui novit abſcondita*, &c. *Epiſcopus imponit dexteram ſuam ſuper caput ejus, & dicit: ordinatus eſt in Eccleſia. Archidiaconus clamat N. Presbyter ad Altare Sanctum Eccleſiæ Sanctæ iſtius loci N. Epiſcopus N. Presbyter. Archidiaconus Pſalmum: Laus huic Paſtori. Poſtea legunt hunc Apoſtolum:* Fratres, poſuit enim

enim deus in Eccleſia ſua primum Apoſtolos, *&c. datque ei Evangelium ut legat. Sequuntur preces, dein ter Kyrie Eleiſon. Epiſcopus precatur, & thus datur ei, circumducuntque ordinatum per Eccleſiam, & adferunt ei Evangelium; dum autem circumducunt eum dicunt Poſitam:* Aſcendit Moſes in Montem Sinai, *&c. Poſtea inſtruit eum de officio ſuo. Explicet ordo Presbyteri.*

Maronites.

Firſt comes he whom Grace hath Elected, and being on both his knees, having his hands joyned, ſayes to the Biſhop, "Your *Beſſing* my Lord: and is bleſſed by the Biſhop: then he ſigns him with the Croſs between his eyes; In the interim the Archdeacon offers Frankincenſe, and ſayes, "Your *Bleſ-*"*ſing* my Lord: Let us all ſtand in "Prayer, and the reſt. Again and a-"gain, continually, and all the time "let us Supplicate the Lord: O Lord, "for the redemption, help, aſſiſtance, "and remiſſion of this thy ſervant *N.* "who ſtands here, and receives the "impoſition of the Divine hand; Give "him,

"him, O Lord, a degree in the Church,
"and perfect Prieſthood. Let us there-
"fore beg, and pray, and ſupplicate,
"and cry out, and ſay, *Kyrie Eleiſon*
"three times. The Biſhop Prays, and
"ſaith, *Thou haſt Sanctified, O God,* and
"the Creed. In the mean time the
Archdeacon leads him in his right
"hand, and ſaith, "We offer, O holy
"Father, and Elect of God, Lord *N.*
"Biſhop, to thy Sanctity, this Lover
"of God, who ſtands here, to receive
"the impoſition of the Divine hand,
"from the Order of Deacon to the Or-
"der of Prieſthood, upon the Holy Al-
"tar of the Holy Church *N.* of the
"bleſſed City that loveth *Chriſt N.*
"for he is ſubject to your Bleſſedneſs.
"For him let us cry out three times,
"and ſay, *Kyrie Eleiſon.* The Biſhop
Prays: "The Divine Grace, which
"always cures the weak, and ſupplies
"defects, promotes this moſt Religi-
"ous Holy Deacon to be a Prieſt. The
Deacon ſays, "In peace, let us beſeech
"the Lord. The Biſhop Prays. The
Deacon proclaims this Ephrem of our
Lord. "Let us all ſtand in Prayer
"before him, who knows all hidden
"things, *&c.* The Biſhop puts his
right

right hand upon his head, and ſayes, "He is ordained in the Church. The "Archdeacon cryes aloud; "*N.* Prieſt "at the Altar of the Holy Church of "this place. *N.* the Biſhop. *N.* Prieſt. The Archdeacon begins the *Pſalm:* "Praiſe to this Shepherd, *&c.* After they Read, this of the Apoſtle: "For, Brethren, God hath placed in "his Church, firſt Apoſtles, *&c.* and gives him the *Goſpel* to Read. Prayers follow, and thrice *Kyrie Eleiſon.* The Biſhop Prays, and Frankincenſe is given to him, and they lead him round about the Church, and bring the *Goſpel* to him; and whilſt they lead him, they ſay,

"*Moiſes* Aſcended Mount *Sinai*, &c. After he inſtructs him in his Office. Here ends the Order of *Prieſthood.*

The *Ritual* for Prieſthood uſed by the *Neſtorians.*

PRimum incipiunt Pater Noſter, &c. *Et Præſul precatur: virtus tua Domine*, &c. *compleat media parvitate noſtra Miniſterium hoc Spirituale doni Sacerdotalis*, &c. *ſcito Domine, quod in omni laudi, & in omni prece, & in omni canone adorant ordinandi ad terram uſque proſtrati. Primum Præſul abſcindit capillos illius qui ordinatur, & cingulo ligat lumbos ejus, & dejicit cucullam ejus ſuper humerum ejus ſiniſtrum, & ingrediens ſtat in medio ſecretarii. Archidiaconus orat, pacem Præſul precatur: Stolam Domine Sacerdotii*, &c. *O tibi ſacerdos quam magnus eſt gradus cui tu miniſtras*, &c. *Venite accedamus ad Sacerdotium*, &c. *Stola Domine Sacerdotii veteris, & novi, qua induiſti veraces tuos, hac indue adorantes te, qui manus ſuas extendunt coram throno divinitatis tuæ*, &c. *Sacerdotes qui digni facti eſtis Angelorum ſtatu, cavete ab iniquitate. Oratio. Oleo Sanctitatis Domine unge hos ſervos tuos*, &c. *Chriſte Sacerdos veritatis, cujus Sacerdotium nunquam omnino præterit, operari erga ſervos tuos id quod adjuvat*

adjuvat, & indue illos ſplendore & decore ut Sacerdotio fungantur tibi præclarè & cautè,&c. Item: Spiritus Sanctus Paraclitus qui deſcendit & habitavit ſuper Diſcipulos, ipſe Domine deſcendat ſuper capita te adorantium, &c. Et accedit ad ordinandos, & utrumque genu eos flectere jubet, ſimul extendentes manus ſuas ſuper occulos ſuos. Et profert Archidiaconus, Oremus. Pax nobiſcum. Et repetit Præſul demiſſè Gratia Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, qui omni tempore, quod deficit ſupplet, cum beneplacito Dei Patris, & cum virtute Spiritus Sancti ſit omni tempore nobiſcum, & perficiat manibus noſtris miniſterium hoc tremendum & excelſum in redemptionem vitæ noſtræ. His dictis, vocem attollit: *Nunc & ſemper.* Deinde ſignat. *Et profert Archidiaconus Pax eum.* Repetitque Præſul hanc manus impoſitionem, manu dextera poſita ſuper caput ejus qui ordinatur dicitque demiſſa voce: *Deus noſter bone,* &c. *Et juxta traditionem Domine Apoſtolicam quæ propagata eſt ad nos uſque in ordinatione miniſterii Eccleſiaſtici: Ecce offerimus tibi hos ſervos tuos ut ſint Presbyteri electi in Eccleſia tua ſancta, & pro iis oramus omnes.* Deinde ſignat eorum capita; di-

citque Archidiaconus: *Tollite oculos veſtros in excelſa ſuprema, & poſtulate miſericordiam à Deo clemente, pro his, & his Diaconis, qui ordinantur & conſtituuntur Presbyteri in Eccleſia Dei cui ſunt ſelecti: Orate pro illis.* Et dicit Præſul ſuper eos demiſſè dum dexteram ſuper eorum capita imponit: *Domine Deus fortis*, &c. *Tu ergo Deus, magnus virtutum, Rex omnium ſeculorum, reſpice etiam nunc in hos ſervos tuos, & elige eos electione ſancta, per habitationem Spiritus Sancti: donaq; illis in operatione oris ſui ſermonem veritatis, & elige illos ad officium ſacerdotale*, &c. Tunc ſignat capita eorum & imperat eis ut adorant proſtrati in terram, & ſurgent. Poſtea Præſul cucullam accipit quæ poſita fuerat ſuper humerum uniuſcuiuſque eorum, & ea illum induit, tollitque orarium de ejus humeris, & illius pectori imponit. Et accipit Epiſcopus ipſe, librum adorandum Evangeliorum, & tradit eum in manibus illius qui ordinationem accepit, eumque ſignat inter oculos pollice dextro, dicitque *ſeparatus eſt, ſanctificatus eſt, perfectus eſt, conſecratus eſt N. in opus Sanctum Eccleſiaſticum, & in miniſtærium Sacerdotis Aaroniticiæ. In nomine Patris*, &c.

Dein

Dein Præſul tollit ab eis Evangelium. Ille vero qui ordinatus eſt flectit genua: Præſul vero baculum ſuum accipit, *&c.* Dum autem dicitur Canon, apprehendit Archidiaconus eos qui ordinati ſunt, & jubet eos ſalutare Altare, & Epiſcopum, & Sacerdotes, & Diaconos; illi autem oſculantur capita illorum. Finit ordo impoſitionis manus Presbyterorum.

Neſtorians.

FIrſt they begin the *Pater Noſter.* And the Prelat Prays: *Thy virtue, O Lord, compleat by our weakneſs this Spiritual Miniſtery of the Sacerdotal guift,* &c. *Know, O Lord, that in every praiſe, and in every Prayer, and in every Canon thoſe that are to be Ordained do adore thee proſtrate upon the ground.* Firſt the Prelate cuts off the hair of the Ordained, and girds his loyns with a Girdle, and caſts his Cawle over his left ſhoulder, and entring, ſtands in the middle before the Altar. The Archdeacon Prays for Peace: The Biſhop Prays; *Give him, O Lord, the Stole of Prieſthood,* &c. Conſider, O Prieſt, how great is the degree to which thou art called. Come let us proceed to the Prieſthood, *&c. O Lord put him on the Stole of antient and modern Prieſthood, wherewith thou haſt clothed thy true believers, with this, clothe theſe that worſhip thee, who ſtretch forth their hands before the Throne of thy Divinity,* &c. Ye Prieſts who are made worthy of the State of Angels, beware of Iniquity. A Prayer. *O Lord anoint theſe thy ſervants with the Unction*

of

of thy holineſs. O Chriſt the Prieſt of Truth, whoſe Prieſthood never faileth, operate upon thy ſervants that which may be moſt helpful, and indue them with ſplendor and beauty, that they may perform their Prieſthood to thee with Perfection and Caution. &c. Item: *Thou, O Lord, let the Holy Ghoſt who deſcended and dwelt upon thy Diſciples, deſcend upon the heads of thoſe that adore thee*, Then he comes to them that are to be Ordained, and commands them to kneel, they extending their hands before their eyes, *&c.* The Archdeacon ſays, "Let "us Pray: *Peace be with us:* And the Biſhop with a loud voice ſaith, *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, which alwayes ſupplies that which is deficient, with the good liking of God the Father, and the vertue of the Holy Ghoſt, be with us ever, and perfect by our hands, this dreadful and high Miniſtry for the Redemption of our life.* Having thus ſpoken, he raiſeth his voice; *Now and for ever.* Then he ſigneth him with the Croſs. And the Archdeacon ſaith, *Peace be to him.* And the Biſhop again putting his right hand upon the head of the Ordained, ſaith with a low voice, *Our good God*, &c. And, *O Lord, according*

to the Apoſtolical Tradition, which hath deſcended to us in the Ordination of Eccleſiaſtical Miniſtry, loe we offer to thee theſe thy ſervants, that they may be elected Prieſts in thy Holy Church, and for them we all Pray, &c. Then he ſigneth their heads with a Croſs, and the Archdeacon ſaith, "Lift up your eyes "to the higheſt Heaven, and implore "Mercy from the God of Clemency, for "theſe, and theſe Deacons, who are or-"dained, and confirmed Prieſts in the "Church of God, to which they are "ſet apart. Pray for them: And the Biſhop with a loud voice, putting his right hand upon their heads, ſaith, *O Lord God of power*, &c. *therefore thou O God, the great God of vertue, and King of all Ages, now alſo look upon theſe thy ſervants, and elect them by thy holy election, through the inhabitation of thy Holy Spirit, and in their Preaching, indue them with the Word of Truth; and Elect them to the Sacerdotal Office*, &c. Then he again ſigns their heads with a Croſs, and commands them to Worſhip proſtrate on the ground, then to riſe. After this the Biſhop takes the Cawle which was put upon their ſhoulders, and puts it on them, and takes the Stole from

from the ſhoulder, and placeth it upon their Breaſt. Then the Biſhop takes the Book of the Holy *Goſpel*, and puts it into the hands of the ordained, and with his right Thumb, ſigns them between the eyes, ſaying, *N.* is ſeparated, ſanctified, is perfect, is Conſecrated in order to the holy work of the Church and Miniſtery of the Aaronitick Prieſthood, *In the Name of the Father*, &c. Then the Biſhop takes from them the Book of the *Goſpel*, and the ordained kneel. Then the Biſhop takes his Paſtoral Staffe. *&c.* and while the *Canon* is Read, the Archdeacon takes the ordained, and commands them to do reverence to the Altar, to the Biſhop, to the Prieſts and Deacons, and they kiſs the head of the ordained.

Here ends the Order of Impoſition of Hands for Prieſthood.

The

The Order of conferring Prieſthood practiſed by the Eutichians, *and the* Jacobites.

THeſe two Sects I joyn together, becauſe they Profeſs the ſame Doctrine, and differ only in name; the *Jacobites* aſſume their denomination from one *Jacobus* a *Syrian*, Diſciple of the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, which was a Profeſt *Eutichian*; This *Jacobus* made it his chief endeavor to ſettle this Belief; and by himſelf, and his adherents, did it ſo ſucceſsfully, that at length they were numerouſly entertained in at leaſt Forty Kingdoms, in the Eaſt, and in *Africa*, under the Patriarch of *Alexandria*. The *Eutichians* therefore and the *Jacobites* agreeing in their Doctrine, the ſame *Liturgy* and *Ritual* were common to both. They both held, That there was ſuch mixture and confuſion between the Divine and Human Nature in *Chriſt*, by reaſon of the Hypoſtatical Union, that there reſulted a Third Nature diſtinct from both, if taken apart, which they call a Theandrical Nature. Yet they deny that the Humane

Humane Nature was converted into the Divine Nature, for that imports a deſtruction of the Human Nature, without which no Converſion could ſubſiſt. This Doctrine hath no leſs Conformity with the *Monothelites*, than oppoſition with the *Neſtorians*; here being a ſure ground for the *Monothelites* to work upon, for if there be but one Nature in *Chriſt*, then there can be but one Will, and one Series of Operation, which is the Doctrine of the *Monothelites*; but all this is repugnant to the Doctrine of *Neſtorius*, who held Two Perſons in *Chriſt*; and proved it thus: A Compleat Nature, and a Perſon are the very ſame thing; but in *Chriſt* there are two Compleat Natures; and therefore Two Perſons. This *Argument* was very vexatious to the *Fathers*, and hath puzled all our *Antient* and *Modern Divines*, and yet to this day there is no Satisfactory Anſwer given to it. But *Eutiches*, in his Principles ſolved it cleerly, by Denying the *Minor*, for he held but One Nature in *Chriſt*, and conſequently but One Perſon. But conſented to *Neſtorius* in the *Major*, and ſo might inſtitute a Sillogiſme againſt him

him thus: A Compleat Nature and a Perſon are the ſame; but in *Chriſt* there is but One Compleat Nature; and therefore but One Perſon. But this is to deſtroy one Error by another.

Wherefore the *Eutychians* and *Jacobites* agreeing in *Doctrine*, agreed alſo in their *Rites* and *Ceremonies*; and from Three Manuſcripts ſent from *Goa* (the *Metropolitan* City of the *Eaſt Indies*) to *Lisbon* in *Portugal*, this *Ritual* is drawn out.

Presbyter, quando ordinatur, ſtat coram Altari, ſubter gradus ipſius, caput habens apertum & inclinatum donec perficiatur oblatio. Tunc Epiſcopus tondet in formam crucis, capillos ejus qui ordinatur, traditque eum inſtitutori ſuo, & præceptum dat illi, de perfectione doctrinæ ſuæ, & ordinis ſui, &c. *Statim poſtea apprehendit Epiſcopus manum ejus dexteram, dicitque* Spiritus Sanctus vocat te, *eumque introducit ad Altare, & procumbere facit ſuper duo illius genua coram Altari, manus habentem junctas ante ſe, & orarium Diaconatus ſuper ſe,* &c.

&c. *Archidiaconus hoc præconium proclamat:* Gratia Domini Noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, quæ omni tempore perficit defectus noſtros ſecundum voluntatem. Dei Patris, in virtute Spiritus Sancti adſit iis qui hic offeruntur, *&c. Ipſa eſt quæ vocat; & offert ex Ordine Diaconorum, ad Ordinem Presbyteratus N. Presbyterum ad Altare Sanctum & divinum domus genetricis Dei Mariæ*, &c. *Precemur igitur omnes, ut deſcendat ſuper eos gratia & illapſus Spiritus Sancti*, &c. *ter Kyrie Eleiſon, & reliqua. Epiſcopus ponit manus ſuas ſuper myſteria, & extendit brachia ſua, colligitque & contrahit ea tribus vicibus ſuper corpus & ſanguinem, accipiens ex calice in pugillum ſuum dum colligant ea, & cooperiunt peplo, ſeu linteo Sacro. Poſtea revertitur ad illum qui eſt ordinandus, & imponit manus ſuper caput ejus eaſque illi admetitur: iterumque attollit manus, porrigens brachia ſua in altum, eaſque deprimit tremulas ſuper caput ejus, hocque tribus vicibus facit Epiſcopus ipſe, oculis ipſius deſuper cum timore aſpicientibus. Poſt hoc ponit dexteram ſuam ſuper illius caput, & tegit manus & caput illius*

qui

qui ordinatur cum Phaina. Dextera illius ponetur ſuper ejus caput, & ſiniſtra hinc & hinc movebitur, circumferetque ſiniſtram ſuam tribus vicibus ſuper cervicem ipſius & faciem, &c. *Invocatio Spiritus Sancti*, &c. *Poſtea revertitur Epiſcopus ad occidentem ad eum qui ordinatur, imponitque dexteram ſuam ſuper caput ejus & eum ſignat inter oculos, ſic dicens: Ordinatus eſt in Eccleſia Sancta Dei. Archidiaconus dicit: N. Presbyter ad Altare Sanctum domus genetricis Dei. Epiſcopus addit N. Presbyter ad Altare Sanctum*, &c. *Epiſcopus: In nomine Patris*, &c. *Cum autem confecerit tria crucis ſigna, tunc qui conſecratur Sacerdos, redit ad Altare, hanc myſtecè dicens orationem:* Suſcepimus gratiam tuam Domine, *&c. Poſt hæc redit Epiſcopus ad eum qui ordinatur, eumque apprehendit per manum ſuam dexteram & erigit, Archidiaconus autem dicit: benedic Domine Epiſcopus accipit orarium quod ſuper ipſum poſitum eſt & traducit illud ſuper humerum ejus dexterum à parte anteriori, dicens:* Ad laudem, & honorem, & decorem, & exaltationem Trinitatis

tatis Sanctæ & conſubſtantialis, & ad pacem, & ædificationem Eccleſiæ Sanctæ Dei. *Reſpondent Clerici:* Ad laudem, *&c. Et cum pompa defert caſulam, & tunicam, & zanadas, & ſingulam, dicitque:* Ad laudem, *&c. Deinde tradit ei thuribulum, & præcipit ut imponat adoramenta. Apprehendit autem Epiſcopus manu eum qui ordinatus eſt, & adducit ut oſculetur menſam vitæ, eaque ſalutata, manum Epiſcopi deoſculatur, qui ipſe pacem illi donat, jubetque ut cæteri omnes pacem illi donent. Et ſtatim obſignat Epiſcopus conſummationem corporis Sancti cum poculo, eumque communicat, & præcipit ut ipſe congregationem communicet. Cruce autem ſignabit, & finiet Epiſcopus.*

Eutichians,

Eutichians, &c.

WHen a Prieſt is Ordained, he ſtands before the Altar, under the ſteps thereof, having his head uncovered, and inclined, till the Oblation is performed; Then the Biſhop cuts the hair of him, that is to be Ordained, into the form of a Croſs, and delivers him to his Tutor, and gives him a Precept concerning the perfection of his Doctrine and Order, *&c.* forthwith afterwards the Biſhop takes him by the right hand, and ſaith, "The *Holy* "*Ghoſt* calls thee: and brings him to the Altar, and places him on both his knees before the Altar, having his hands joyn'd before him, and a Deacons Veſtment upon him, *&c.* The Archdeacon ſpeaks aloud this Prayer; *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, who alwayes makeſt perfect our defects, according to the will of God the Father, in the virtue of the Holy Ghoſt, be preſent with theſe, who are here offered*, &c. It is it who calls and offers *N.* from the degree of Deacon, to the degree of a Prieſt, at the Holy and Divine Altar of the

the Houſe of the Mother of God, *Mary*, &c. "Therefore let us all Pray, "that Grace and the Holy Spirit may "deſcend upon them, *&c.* thrice *Kyrie Eleiſon*, &c. The Biſhop puts his hands upon the Myſtery, and ſtretcheth forth his armes, and gathers and contracts them thrice over the Body and Blood, taking out of the Chalice the Particles, whilſt they gather them together, and cover them with a Veil or Sacred Linnen. After he turns to him that is to be Ordained, and puts his hand on his head, and meaſures them to him: and again lifts up his hands, ſtretching out his armes on high, and lets his hands fall trembling upon his head. This the Biſhop repeats three times, his eyes looking down with fear. After this he lays his right hand on his head, and covers the head and hands of him that is to be Ordained with a Vaile. His right hand is placed upon his head, and his left is moved to and fro, and he turns his left hand thrice about his neck and face, *&c.* Invocation of the *Holy Ghoſt*, &c. Afterward the Biſhop turns to the Weſt, towards him that is to be Ordained, and puts his right

hand on his head, and ſigns him with the Croſs between his eyes, ſaying thus: "He is Ordain'd in the Holy "Church of God. The Archdeacon ſaith, "*N.* Prieſt, at the Holy Altar of "the Houſe of the Mother of God. The Biſhop adds, *N.* Prieſt at the Holy Altar, *&c. In the Name of the Father*, &c. After he hath made three ſigns of the Croſs, the Prieſt Ordained returns to the Altar Myſtically ſaying this Prayer: "We have received thy Grace "O Lord, *&c.* Then the Biſhop returns to him, and takes him by the right hand, and lifts him up. The Archdeacon ſaith, "Your Bleſſing my Lord. The Biſhop takes the Stole which was upon him, and brings it over his right ſhoulder, from the fore-part, ſaying, "To the Praiſe, and Ho-"nor, and Beauty, and Exaltation of the "Holy, and Conſubſtantial Trinity, and "to the Peace and Edification of the "Holy Church of God. The Clergy Anſwer, "To the Praiſe, *&c.* And when he with Pompe carries the Veſtment, and Tunick, and Girdle, *&c.* and ſaith, "To the Praiſe, *&c.* Afterwards delivers to him a Cenſer, and commands him to put Incenſe therein:

Moreover

Moreover the Biſhop takes him by the hand, and leads him to kiſs the Table of Life, which being done, he kiſſeth the Biſhops hand, who gives him his Peace, and commands all the reſt to do the like. And forthwith the Biſhop ſigns with the Croſs the Conſummation of the Holy Body with the Cup, and after he hath communicated, Orders, that he Communicate the Congregation, the Biſhop ſhall ſign with the Croſs, and conclude.

The Ritual *of the* Cophticks, *or* Ægyptians *for the Ordination of Prieſts.*

THe difference between the *Cophticks* and the *Jacobites* is not conſiderable, only they who lived in *Perſia*, *Syria*, *Aſſyria*, and the Eaſt, were called *Jacobites*. But they who inhabited *Ægypt* and *Æthiopia* were called *Cophticks*, whoſe *Ritual* differs but little from the *Jacobites*, which is as followeth.

Cum volunt præſentare Ordinandum in Sacerdotem, teſtificantur primo Sacerdotes de operibus ejus bonis, & de ſcientia ejus, & quod uxor ejus talis ſit, qualem lex requirit, quod acceperit inferiores gradus, &c. *Deinde prodit foras veſtitus veſte Diaconi, & baltheus ſuper humerum ejus ſiniſtrum, coram altari. Stet autem Epiſcopus cum Sacerdotibus. Et qui ſeparatus eſt incurvat genua ſua ante Altare. Epiſcopus dicit gratiarum actionem, & accipit ſimul thymiama, & orat ſuper illud converſuſque facie ſua ad Altare dicit hanc orationem:* O Domine Deus

Deus qui venire nos feciſti, *&c.* He prays for the *Holy Ghoſt*, and Grace to adminiſter Prieſthood right. Ecce venit ad te Ordinandus in Sacerdotem, perfice eum in ſervum tuum, *&c. Dicit Archidiaconus: Gratia Domini Noſtri Jeſu Chriſti,* &c as above. Ter Kyrie Eleiſon. *Epiſcopus converſus ad orientem hanc orationem dicit:* Queſo Domine Deus pone eum dignum vocatione Presbyteratus, *&c.* ut miniſtret Altari tuo ſancto, *&c.* ter Kyrie Eleiſon. *Converſus ad occidentem Epiſcopus ponit manum ſuam dextram ſuper caput ejus ſic orando:* O Domine Deus omnipotens, *&c.* Reſpice ſuper hunc ſervum tuum, qui tibi præſentatur ad ſacerdotium, per approbationem & judicium eorum qui tibi eum ſtiterunt, *&c.* Reple eum Spiritu Sancto & gratia, *&c.* The Biſhop Prays for him, that he may worthily perform the functions of Prieſthood, *&c. Et converſus ad occidentem ſignat frontem ejus pollice ſuo, dicens:* vocamus te in Eccleſiam Dei Sanctam. Amen. *Alta voce dicit Archidiaconus* N. Sacerdos eſt Altaris Sancti, quod eſt in Eccleſia Sancta Catholica, & Apoſtolica, Eccleſia Dei, Amen. *Deinde clara voce Epiſ-*

copus dicit: vocamus te N. Sacerdotem Altaris Sancti, quod vocatur Orthodoxorum, in nomine Patris, *&c. Facit Epiſcopus ſuper frontem ejus tres cruces, ſignificando Trinitatem. Deinde veſtit illum ſtola, dicens:* Gloria & honor Trinitati Sanctæ, conſubſtantiali Patri, & Filio, & Spiritui Sancto. Pax & incrementum Eccleſiæ Dei Sanctæ. Amen. *Converſus ad orientem Epiſcopus orat ſic:* Gratias tibi agimus, *&c.* A Thanſgiving to God, and a Petition, that the Ceremonies of Ordination may pleaſe him. Then follows an Admonition to the Prieſt newly Ordained. *Et juramento præſtito, oſculatur Epiſcopum, Altare, & præſentes. Deinde explicat aliquid de myſteriis. Et Epiſcopus ponit ſuper eum manum tribus vicibus, & omnes dicunt alta voce:* dignus eſt N. ut ſit Sacerdos in Eccleſia Sancta Catholica, & Apoſtolica. And ſo it ends.

The

The Cophticks *and* Ægyptians.

WHen they would preſent him that is to be Ordained Prieſt, firſt of all the Prieſts give Teſtimony of his good Works, and his Learning, and that his Wife is ſuch as the Law requires; that he hath received the Inferior Orders, *&c.* Then he comes forth in his Deacons Habit, and having a Stole on his left ſhoulder, he ſtands before the Altar. The Biſhop likewiſe ſtands with his Prieſts. And he that is ſeparated kneels before the Altar. The Biſhop recites a Prayer of Thanſgiving, and at the ſame time takes the Incenſe and bleſſeth it; and turning his face to the Altar, he recites this Prayer; *O Lord God who haſt ordered our coming*, &c. *Behold he that is to be Ordained Prieſt comes to thee, make him thy true ſervant*, &c. The Archdeacon ſaith, *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, &c. as above: Three times *Kyrie Eleiſon:* Then the Biſhop turning towards the Eaſt, ſaith this Prayer, *O Lord God, we beſeech thee, render him worthy of the vocation of Prieſthood*, &c. *that he may Adminiſter*

upon thy Holy Altar, &c. Three times *Kyrie Eleiſon*. Then the Biſhop turning towards the Weſt puts his right hand upon the Ordaineds head, Praying thus: *O Lord God, Omnipotent*, &c. *look upon this thy ſervant, who is preſented to thee in order to Prieſthood, by the approbation and judgment of thoſe that propoſe him*, &c. *Repleniſh him with the Holy Ghoſt, and Grace*, &c. The Biſhop Prays for him, that he may worthily perform the Functions of Prieſthood, *&c.* And turning to the Weſt, ſigns his forehead with his Thumb, ſaying, *We call thee into the Holy Church of God. Amen.* The Archdeacon with a loud voice ſaith, *N. is a Prieſt of the Holy Altar, which is in the Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church of God, Amen.* Then with a clear voice the Biſhop ſaith, *We call thee N. a Prieſt of the Holy Altar, which is called of the true Believers, In the Name of the Father*, &c. Then the Biſhop makes three Croſſes on his forehead, ſignifying the *Trinity*. Then he puts the Stole about him, ſaying, *Glory and Honor be to the Holy Trinity conſubſtantial with the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt. Peace and increaſe of the Holy Church of God, Amen.*

Then

Then the Biſhop turning to the Eaſt, prays thus, *We give thee Thanks*, &c. A Thanſgiving to God, and a Petition that the Ceremonies of Ordination may pleaſe him. Then follows an Admonition to the Prieſt newly Ordained, who having taken the uſual Oath, kiſſeth the Biſhops hand, the Altar, and thoſe that are preſent. Then he explicates ſomething of the Myſteries, and the Biſhop puts his hand three times upon him, and all ſay with a loud voice, *N. is worthy to be a Prieſt in the Holy Catholick and Apoſtolick Church.* And ſo it ends.

Theſe *Rituals* were with great trouble and induſtry Collected from ſeveral parts of the World by *Morinus*, who ſaw the Originals, and Tranſlated them out of *Greek* and *Syrian*, into *Latine*, as you may ſee in his *Treatiſe de Sacra Ordinatione*, *part* 2.

Thus I have given you a Curſary View of the Manner how the Chiefeſt Profeſſors of Chriſtianity, diſperſt all the World over, did Confer the Order of

of Prieſthood; which compared to the preſent practiſe of the Church of *Rome*, it will be obvious how this Church hath deviated, in Eſſentials, from the Inſtitution of *Chriſt*, the practice of the *Apoſtles*, and the Primitive Church, which, by conſidering the particulars of the *Roman Pontifical* now in uſe, will plainly appear.

A

A Draught of the Roman Pontifical *for the Ordination of Prieſts now in uſe.*

THe Biſhop that is to give Orders, is not to do it but in Maſs, and in the ſeveral parts thereof, he exerciſeth the ſeveral Functions of Ordination. They that are to be Ordained Prieſts being by the Archdeacon preſented, and accepted. The Biſhop begins by the impoſition of his hands upon the head of them ſucceſſively; but ſays nothing. Then they return again, and the Biſhop puts his right hand upon the head of each of them, and the Prieſts that are preſent do the like, putting their hands by the Biſhops. Then the Biſhop ſays a Prayer, imploring Grace for them that are to be Ordained, that they may worthily comply with the Functions of Prieſthood. This done, the Ordainer takes the Stole of each, that was before upon their left ſhoulder only, and brings it round the neck, and puts it upon the right ſhoulder

ſhoulder alſo, with theſe words, *Accipe jugum Domini*, &c. *Receive the yoke of the Lord*, &c. Conſequent to this he puts on their Caſula, or Prieſtly Veſtment, the hinder part being folded up, and faſtned to the upper part, with this Forme, *Accipe Veſtem Sacerdotalem*, &c. *Receive the Prieſtly Veſtment*, &c. Next follows the Annointing of their Heads with Holy Oyle. And the Prieſts that aſſiſt, tye the Palmes of their hands together with a Linnen Binder, leſt the Holy Oyle ſhould be profaned. Perſuant to this, the Biſhop, holding in his hand a Chalice with Wine and Water in it, and upon it a Patene, with an unconſecrated Hoaſt on it, exhibits all this ſucceſſively to them that are to be Ordained; and here great care is taken by the Ordainer, and the aſſiſting Prieſts, that they at the ſame time touch the Chalice, the Pattene, and the Hoaſt, to which end (becauſe their hands are bound together) the Prieſts place their fore-fingers upon the Pattene, ſo as to touch both Pattene and Hoaſt, and the tops of their middle fingers, being a little ſeparated

parated from the fore-fingers, are applyed to the ſide of the Chalice under the Patene; and the Prieſts in this poſture, preſs their fingers upon the Veſſels alltogether, and the Ordainer begins not the forme till he be aſſured, that they touch all, then he pronounceth the forme in theſe words, *Accipe poteſtatem offerendi Sacrificium pro vivis & defunctis, In nomine Patris, & filii, & Spirituus Sancti. Receive the power of offering Sacrifice for the Living, and the Dead. In the Name of the Father*, &c. This done, they are eſteemed Prieſts, *Quoad poteſtatem ordinis*, for as much as concerns the power of Conſecrating, and ſaying Maſs, and therefore they Conſecrate together with the Biſhop, and ſay Maſs all along with him, having their Miſſals open before them. Then after Conſummation, when they have all received the Communion, the Biſhop the third time puts his hand upon their heads with this form: *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiſeritis peccata remittuntur eis, & quorum retinueritis retenta ſunt. Receive the Holy Ghoſt; whoſe ſins ye forgive, they are forgiven, and*

and whoſe ſins you retain, they are retained. Then preſently he unfolds their Veſtment, and lets it down behind, ſaying, *Stola innocentiæ induat te Dominus. The Lord put thee on the Stole of Innocence.* And ſo it ends.

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.

Shewing, That the Church of Rome *placeth the Eſſence of the Ordination of Prieſts in touching the Veſſels, and the Form annexed to it.*

TO make good this Poſition, I begin with the Autority of the Council of *Florence*, *Inſtructione ad Armenos*, where it Treats, *ex profeſſo*, of the Eſſential matter of Prieſthood, and the Council aſſigns for this matter, the Tradition of the Veſſels, and makes not the leaſt mention of the Impoſition of Hands, nor any other matter. *Florent. Inſtructione Armenorum.*

Gregory the 9th tells us, That if in Ordination the Impoſition of Hands be omitted, the Ordination is not to be reiterated: his words are theſe: *Presbyter, & Diaconus cum ordinantur, manus impoſitionem tactu corporali (ritu ab Apoſtolis introducto) recipiunt. Quod ſi omiſſum fuerit, non eſt aliquatenus iterandum, ſed ſtatuto tempore, ad hujuſmodi Ordines conferendos, cautè ſupplendum, quod per errorem extitit prætermiſſum.* A Prieſt and a Deacon when *Greg. 9. C. Presbyter, de Sacramentis non-iterandis.*

when they are Ordain'd, receive the Impoſition of Hands by a Corporal Contact (a Rite which was Introduc't by the *Apoſtles*) which if it ſhould be omitted, is not forthwith to be reiterated, but at the appointed time, for the conferring ſuch Orders, what was omitted, is to be carefully ſupplied. This cleerly ſuppoſeth the Ordination to be valid, by the Tradition of the Veſſels, and its Form, without the Impoſition of Hands, for otherwiſe the whole ought to be renewed, becauſe the former was all invalid; and yet Pope *Gregory* ſaith, That only was to be ſupplyed, that was omitted in the former Ordination, and not till the next time of Ordination, which is commonly three Months after, for the Orders are given but four times in a year, which they call the *quatuor tempora*. Hence I conclude, that Pope *Gregory* held the Impoſition of Hands to be circumſtantial, and accidentary, but not at all belonging to the Subſtance and Eſſence of Ordination.

Aquinas 3. *Parte, q.* 35. *ar.* 3.

Next St. *Thomas* of *Aquine*, their greateſt Divine, whoſe Doctrine, all the Dominicans, and Jeſuits, are bound, by their Rules, to follow, holds the ſame,

ſame. So alſo *Joannes della Cruz in directoria conſcientiæ Parte* 2. *de Sacramento Ordinis. Dub.* 2. *Concluſione* 1. *Bonacina de Sacramentis*, *D.* 8. *q. unica. Puncto* 3. *Nu.* 2. *Gregorius de Valentia*, *To.* 4. *D.* 9. *q.* 1. *Puncto* 5. *Gravina* Treats it fuſely, *De* 2. *de materia & forma Sacramentorum*, *Sect.* 7. *Concluſione* 3. *Dominic Soto in* 4. *Diſt.* 24. *q.* 1. *Ar.* 4. *Didacus Nugnez Comment. in Sanctum Thomam. Sect.* Septimus Ordo. *Antonius Diana Parte* 2. *Moral. Reſol. Tract.* 4. *de Sacram. Reſolut.* 187. *Domitius Chamerota* aſſerts that by the Tradition of the Veſſels, the Character is Imprinted, and the Ordained is properly a Prieſt. The ſame is Taught by *Philippus Gammachæus*, *C.* 8. *de Ordine. Iſambertus*, *Vaſques*, *Sylvius*, *Tannerus*, *Eſtius*, *Puteanus*, *Meratius*, and the greateſt part of their Divines, for to cite them all were endleſs; And eſpecially their Moral Divines, who ſolve all their Caſes, in this matter, by this Opinion. Hence they reſolve, that if it be certain that the Ordained did not touch the Chalice, or if he did touch the Chalice, but not the Patene, he muſt be Reordained abſolutely; but if it be doubtful whether he touched them or

Chamerota Tract. 11. *de Septem Sacram. c.* 3.

no, then he is to be Ordained again conditionally, *&c.* And if there be clear evidence, that one in his Ordination, did not touch those Vessels, I would fain know whether any Divine in the Church of *Rome*, either Moral or Scholastical, dare assert, that such a one ought not to be Reordained?

He gives you one Example out of *Busenbaum*.

To clear this Point, and remove all doubts of it, let us hear what *Busenbaum* saith, one of their Moral Divines, whose Works are so famous, that the Tenth Edition was Printed at *Munster*, *Anno Dom.* 1661. His words are these: *Quando dubium occurrit an ordo sit verè collatus, v. g. quia materia fuit dubia, iterari potest, & debet sub conditione. Quando verò sunt rationes utrinque probabiles pro utilitate, & validitate, ait Diana, p. 5. t. 3. R. 47. ex Grac. posse iterari sub conditione; imo debere, si sit Episcopalis, vel Sacerdotalis; v. g. Si Sacerdos, vel Episcopus non tetigisset vasa sacra, aut illud instrumentum in cujus porrectione imprimitur character; Excipit tamen Sacerdotem, qui immediatè tetigit Patenam, sed non hostiam. Cum verò qui non tetigit calicem, & patenam, dum forma proferebatur, sed paulo post, posse quidem*

quidem, ad majorem animi ſui quietem, ſub conditione iterum ordinari, non tamen eſſe neceſſarium, docet Card. de Lugo. Reſp. moral. L. 1. d. 31. Rectè autem notat Diana, etiamſi quis timeat, ne invalidè ordinatus ſit, aut non recordetur ſe tetigiſſe vaſa ſacra, aut non tetigiſſe imaginetur, non illico iterandum eſſe ordinem, cum ſola oblivio, aut timor non ſufficiat ad prudens, ac rationabile dubium, vel probabilitatem: By this Diſcourſe it plainly appears, that they place the whole Eſſence of the Order of Prieſthood, in the touching of thoſe Veſſels, which the Biſhop tenders to them, which is their Eſſential matter; and in the words which the Biſhop pronounces, while the Ordained touches thoſe Veſſels, which is their Eſſential Form. So that if we conſult Autority, this Poſition muſt certainly prevail.

See *Bonacina, D.* 8. *q.* 2. *puncto* 3. who confirms this at large.

A Second Proof is grounded in this Principle, That not only the matter and form, which are the Eſſentials, but alſo a right intention in the Miniſter is rigorouſly neceſſary for the validity of Order. So the Council of *Florence: Hæc omnia Sacramenta tribus perficiuntur,*

Florentinum Inſtructione ad Armenos.

tur, videlicet rebus tanquam materia, verbis tanquam forma, & perſona Miniſtri conferentis Sacramentum cum intentione faciendi quæ facit Eccleſia; quorum ſi aliquod deſit, non perficitur Sacramentum. All theſe Sacraments are perfected by three things, to wit, by Things as the Matter, by Words as the Form, and by the Perſon of the Miniſter, conferring the Sacrament with intention to do that which the Church doth: whereof, if any be wanting, the Sacrament is not compleat. This ſuppoſed, I prove my intent; for the Miniſter of Prieſthood ought not, cannot in prudence have any intention to confer this Order by any other matter and forme, then the tradition of the Veſſels and this forme, *Accipe poteſtatem offerendi ſacrificium pro vivis & defunctis, in nomine Patris*, &c. Take power to offer Sacrifice for the Living and the Dead, *&c.* for by theſe words he is to give the Ordained a Power to offer Sacrifice, wherein conſiſts the Order of Prieſthood, according to them. Wherefore, if his intention do not accompany the plain, clear, and explicit ſenſe of his words, it would be a meer fiction; for he ſaith, Take, Receive, *&c.* and in the mean time intends

tends to give them nothing: and ſo without this intention he would be a meer deluder. Hence I conclude, that he muſt intend to confer the Order of Prieſthood by that matter and forme; neither can he affix his intention to the Impoſition of hands, nor to any thing elſe contained in the forme of Ordination, for then he would attempt to confer the ſame Order to the ſame perſon twice, which is a Sacrilege in all Sacraments that imprint a Character, as the Order of Prieſthood doth.

But it may be Objected, That the Ordainer directs not his intention to this particular matter nor that, but regulates himſelf by the intention of the Church, without examining particulars, as the Council of *Florence* directs. 'Tis well that you have exempted the Ordainer from reprehenſion: But then I muſt demand, What intention the Church had in introducing this new Matter and Forme? ſo explicitely, and in expreſs terms ſignifying the collation of Prieſtly Power to proceed from hence, and conſequently the Character to be hereby imprinted? for if theſe are not intended as Eſſentials, then you have

removed the fiction from the Ordainer, and attributed it to the Church; ſo that the one or the other muſt be the Author of it, but as to this preſent controverſie it matters not which. And indeed, to ſolve all, there is but one way, which is, to grant, that the tradition of the Veſſels, and the Forme of Words thereunto annexed, do Eſſentially confer the Order, and imprint the Character.

The Third Proofe is made out by induction, which to effect, we muſt make a ſtrict inquiry into all the parts contained in the *Roman Ritual*, to deprehend, if any one of them have any proportionable capacity in order to this effect. The firſt impoſition of hands can have none, becauſe there is no Form appropriated to it, neither can a bare Matter without a Forme, conſtitute the adequate Eſſence of a Sacrament. The Second Impoſition of hands, though there be a Form accommodated to it, yet it is neither Indicative, or Enunciative, nor Imperative, but only Deprecatory, which is not ſufficient to ſatisfie the See of *Rome*. But however, as the *Roman Ritual* for Prieſthood

Prieſthood is diſpoſed, the Order of Prieſthood can never proceed from hence, except the touching of the Veſſels with its Forme, be wholly left out; for in caſe Prieſthood ſhould be validly conferr'd by this Impoſition of Hands and its Forme, then the tendring the Veſſels afterwards to him that is already Ordained, with theſe words, *Accipe poteſtatem:* Take a power to offer Sacrifice, *&c.* would be a Sacrilegious and Fallacious attempt to Reordain him that was before validly Ordained, and had the Character of Prieſthood imprinted upon him, and this would be conſtantly practiſed through the whole extent of the Church. Beſides, this Doctrine is wholly deſtitute of Autority, for there are few or no Divines that inſiſt upon this. What then remains? only the Third Impoſition of Hands, which follows a long time after, about the end of Maſs, with theſe words, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remiſeritis peccata, remittuntur eis, & quorum retinueritis, retenta ſunt.* Receive the Holy Ghoſt: they whoſe ſins you forgive are forgiven, and they whoſe ſins you retain are retained. This likewiſe hath no proportion to

confer the Order of Prieſthood. Firſt, becauſe it ſuppoſeth that Order already conferr'd; for none but a Prieſt is ſufficiently qualified to receive a Power of Relaxing and Retaining ſins. But in the Primitive Church, this power was ever eſteemed a branch of Presbytery, neceſſarily reſulting from the Validity of Ordination, ſo that all Prieſts had the Radical Power of Abſolving, but they were not to practice it without a Deputation from their Biſhop: neither is it above Four hundred and Fifty years ſince this Forme was thruſt into the *Ritual*, and by reaſon of its novelty, as not being inſtituted by *Chriſt*, as Eſſential to the Ordination of Prieſthood, cannot participate of the nature of a Sacrament, nor any way belong to the Eſſentials of Ordination. Laſtly, That this Matter and Forme have no influence upon the Power of Conſecrating, or offering Sacrifice, is evidently evinced from hence, That all they who receive it, had before ſaid Maſs with the Biſhop, and Conſecrated with him, and to that end the Canon, and eſpecially the words of Conſecration (that uſually are pronounced with a lower voice)

are

are by the Biſhop pronounced aloud, and diſtinctly, becauſe the Ordained may accompany him, for he that firſt ends the words of Conſecration, doth truly Conſecrate, and none of the reſt, except they direct their intention to that inſtant in which the Biſhop pronounceth the laſt ſyllable. How then can this laſt impoſition of Hands, or its Forme, any way conduce to the Power of Order? It therefore remains, that nothing contained in the *Roman Ritual* for Prieſthood, can be Eſſential to that Order, except the Tradition of the Veſſels with its Forme; all the reſt being accidentary, and circumſtantial, as I ſhall prove hereafter by their own Authors.

All this is confirmed by the practiſe preſcribed in the *Roman Ritual* for degrading a Prieſt. *Miniſtri tradunt in manus degradandi, calicem cum vino & aqua, ac patena, & hoſtia, quam Pontifex Degradator, aufert de manibus degradandi.* The Miniſters deliver into the hands of him that is to be degraded, a Chalice with Wine, and Water, and a Patene and Hoaſte, which the Biſhop that is the Degrader, takes out of the

the hands of the degraded; becauſe, by delivering theſe Veſſels to him, he was Ordained Prieſt: and therefore by taking them from him again, they think him ſufficiently deveſted of that dignity.

This Truth is ſo apparent, that it needs no other proofe, then to obſerve in their Ordination, how indifferent and unconcerned they are in all parts thereof, except in delivering the Veſſels, and pronouncing the Forme that affects them, here one Prieſt inſpects one ſide, another ſurveys the other ſide, and they keep ſuch a preſſing of the Ordaineds hands, both on the Patene and Chalice, that no Error be committed in the application of theſe Veſſels, that the beholder will preſently conclude, that they eſteem the whole ſubſtance of Ordination to conſiſt in this. Diſcourſe their Clergy, and you will find, that no one doubts it. Read the Forme, *Accipe poteſtatem*, &c. Receive the power, *&c.* and you will certainly conclude, that it ſignifieth nothing elſe. And they who live amongſt them and converſe with them, cannot but know their general and unanimous belief and perſwaſion, that the Order of Prieſthood

Prieſthood is validly conferr'd by the touching of thoſe Veſſels, and the Form which accompanys it, and the Character thereby imprinted, and Sacramental Grace conferr'd.

Wherefore, as to the thing in ſubſtance I offer this Dilemma: either the Order of Prieſthood is validly conferr'd by touching the Veſſels, and the Forme appropriated to it, and the Character thereby imprinted, or not. If the firſt be granted, that is the ſcope of our preſent intention. If the ſecond, then I declare, that the words which the Ordainer pronounceth, are Nugatory, Deluſive, and Fallacious; for the words are Imperative, whereby the Biſhop bids the Ordained receive a power of offering Sacrifice (which in effect is Prieſthood) and the Ordained, who comes full fraught with an ardent deſire of receiving it, conſequently accepts it, and yet notwithſtanding this offer and acceptation, he is deluded; for that power being Spiritual, and ſo inviſible, as is alſo the Character, he conceives himſelf impower'd to offer Sacrifice, and his Soul conſequently imbelliſht, with a new, and high Prerogative, in plain and explicite words offered

offered him, and yet is defrauded, and diſappointed of his expectation, for that Matter and Forme (as we ſuppoſe by the ſecond part of the Dilemma) is not capable to confer upon him ſuch a dignity, notwithſtanding the Promiſe.

SECT. V.

SECT. V.

The Order of Prieſthood, according to the preſent Inſtitution, cannot be validly conferr'd by touching the Veſſels with this Forme, Accipe poteſtatem, *&c.*

THE Ordinations and Inſtitutions of *Chriſt*, none can attempt to abrogate, or alter, without a Sacrilegious temerity, for they carry with them an irrefragable Autority, they are *Juris Divini*, of Divine Right; they are Sacred, and therefore no Human Power upon Earth, can make any change or alteration in them; and more eſpecially, when by *Divine Inſtitution* Supernatural effects are produced by Natural cauſes; as it falls out in the Ordination of Prieſts; for when it is validly conferr'd, there is communicated to the Receiver, a Spiritual capacity, to exerciſe all the Functions of Prieſthood; there is a Power granted to him over the Real Body, and the Myſtical Body of

of *Chriſt*; the firſt by Conſecration in the Euchariſt; the ſecond by Relaxing, and Retaining ſins. There is alſo imprinted upon the Soul of the Ordained a Character, which is a Real Phyſical and Supernatural quality; neither is it Supernatural only *quoad modum*, in the circumſtances of producing it; but *quoad entitatem*, the very Intrinſecal Nature and Eſſence of it, is Supernatural, becauſe no exigence of Nature can ever challenge it as due, in any circumſtances whatſoever. From the ſame cauſe alſo proceeds an increaſe, of Sanctifying, and inherent Grace in the Soul of the Ordained, as alſo a plentiful ſupply of Actual, and Tranſient Graces, whereby his Underſtanding is Illuminated, and his Will Fortified, in all occaſions conducing to the Functions of his Order, all which are, according to their Intrinſecal Nature, Supernatural.

And yet the cauſes from which theſe ſtrange effects proceed, are of themſelves purely Natural, having no proportion to ſuch Supernatural products. They have only a Radical Obediential capacity, to be aſſumed, and elevated above their Nature, by the powerful hand

hand of the Omnipotent, to produce, joyntly with him, any effect that involves not a contradiction. Thus the Natural Element of Water is Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, to produce Spiritual and Supernatural Grace, and to deſtroy Original Sin. And in our preſent caſe, the Impoſition of Hands (though Natural in it ſelf) was appointed by *Chriſt* our Redeemer to produce the forementioned effects, waving the queſtion, whether the Cauſality of Sacraments be Phyſical, or only Moral, which the *Divines* Diſpute.

And as there is no power upon earth, that can abrogate, or alter *Chriſts* Inſtitutions, or deveſt thoſe Natural Cauſes of that Efficacity, which by an Irrevocable Decree, the Author of Grace hath given them, ſo there is no Created Power, neither *Human* nor *Angelical*, that can validly inſtitute, appoint, ordain, or determine any Natural Cauſe whatſoever, to produce any Supernatural effect, becauſe all Created Power, how great ſoever, is limited and confin'd within the bounds of *Nature*, and ſo neither formally, nor virtually, nor eminently, contains that Supereminent Vertue, or proportion with

with Supernatural Effects, which are far above its Sphear: How then can it Communicate to other Cauſes, that High Vertue, which it no way contains in it ſelf? Hence it enſues, that as all the power of Nature, though it ſummon, and muſter up all its ſtrength, can never deprive thoſe Natural Entities Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, of this Supereminent Prerogative, nor hinder their effects, when duly applyed to Subjects capable, according to *Chriſts* Inſtitution; ſo likewiſe, neither can it remove, or transfer this operative quality from thoſe cauſes, to which *Chriſt* hath affixt it, and place it upon others of its own invention and determination. For no pure Creature, can alter, change, or abrogate a Divine Law; And in this caſe, the word Incarnate is the Legiſlator, or Law-giver, and therefore none but himſelf can make any Change in his own Law. Except Man, that is but a meer Creature, will wage War with his Creator, and Uſurp to himſelf a Power that never was, nor ever will be granted him, it being peculiar to God alone.

The ground of this Doctrine is not New, but Admitted by All, and is common

common to both Churches. For this is the Argument that St. *Auguſtin* uſed againſt the *Pelagians*, who held a proportion in our Natural Acts to Merit Glory; and the *Semipelagians*, or *Maſſilienſes*, endeavouring a Moderation, attributed to our Natural Acts, a power of Meriting Supernatural Grace; and this obtained, rendered us capable of Meriting Glory. Which Opinions are both condemned as Heretical, chiefly upon this Principle, That whatſoever is Natural, hath no proportion, with things Supernatural; which common Reaſon dictates. Thus far in General: now we'll deſcend to Particulars.

The Queſtion in agitation is, whether the touching the Veſſels, that is, the Chalice with Wine, and Water in it, and the Patene with an Hoaſt, be the Eſſential Matter and Forme of the Order of Prieſthood? I Aſſert that it is not, becauſe it was never aſſum'd nor appointed by the Divine Inſtitutor for that end. This being a thing of Fact, muſt be made out by the Teſtimony of thoſe that beſt knew. None are more competent Witneſſes, nor were better acquainted with the

Tranſactions of *Chriſt*, then his *Apoſtles*, who were eye-Witneſſes of his proceedings, and to whom *Chriſt* communicated ſuch things as chiefly concerned his Church. And they have left their Teſtimony in Writing, to be inviolably obſerved in future times, and yet have no where left the leaſt mention of this Matter and Forme. If any ſuch thing had been Inſtituted by their Divine Maſter, it is moſt unlikely, and wholly incredible, that in a matter of ſuch moment, and high concern, wherein the very being of the Church depended, they ſhould have paſt it over in deep ſilence, and never have given the leſt intimation of it, neither in Word nor Writing, to thoſe of the Primitive Church, that immediately ſucceeded them. But ſo it is, the *Apoſtles* never mention it; All Antiquity is wholly ignorant of it; ſearch all the Minuteſt Paſſages of Scripture, read all the Authors of the Infancy, and Growth of the Church, Examine all the Liturgies, and Rituals of Ordination, the *Latines*, *Greeks*, the *Syrian Maronites*, the *Neſtorians*, the *Eutichians*, the *Jacobites*, the *Cophticks*, the *Ægyptians*, the *Babilonians*, the *Æthiopians*, &c. Peruſe

uſe all the Records of Councils, and you ſhall find nothing but a profound Silence, and Ignorance of any ſuch thing, till about 700 years ſince, as you may ſee above *Section* II. in the Ritual of *Conſtantinus Caëtanus*. In the Antient Rituals, as well of the *Latines*, as the *Greeks* and others, there is frequent mention made of the Impoſition of Hands in Ordination, which was ever held Eſſential to the Order of Prieſthood, but of Touching the Veſſels not a word. Whence we may certainly conclude, that thoſe Veſſels were never Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, as the Eſſential Matter of Prieſthood, nor the Words annexed thereunto, as the Eſſential Forme. Let us now Collect what hath been proved in this *Section*: Nothing but that which *Chriſt* Inſtituted is the Eſſential Matter and Forme of the Order of Prieſthood; But *Chriſt* never Inſtituted the Touching of the Veſſels, and the words annexed to it; *ergo*, the Touching of the Veſſels, and the Words annexed to it, are not the Eſſential Matter, and Forme of the Order of Prieſthood; the Premiſes have been here clearly proved, and the Concluſion is legally inferr'd.

For a farther Proof of this Aſſertion, we muſt drive it a little higher, and conſider the fatal conſequences that would enſue from their Doctrine, were it true. For if the Matter and Forme, ſpecifyed in the Title of this *Section*, be the Eſſentials of the Order of Prieſthood, then it inevitably follows, that the *Greeks*, and all the Chriſtians diſperſt over all the *Eaſt*, yea, and the *Latin* Church alſo, for a Thouſand years after *Chriſt*, had never any Valid Ordination, becauſe they all wanted the Eſſentials of Prieſthood, for all theſe never made uſe of the Veſſels, nor the Forme annexed to them, as appears by their Rituals (And to this day none but the *Latines*, ever applyed this Matter and Forme to him that was to be Ordained Prieſt) and therefore could have no True Patriarchs, no Biſhops, nor Prieſts among them. A very ſad Illation, and of vaſt conſequence; for no Prieſt, no Church. What then, Muſt the Church of *Rome*, to keep up, and Maintain their Innovation, which is a Meer Humane Invention, Un-Church all the Profeſſors of *Chriſtianity* in the World for a Thouſand years together, and a conſiderable

ſiderable part of them to this day, and leave them deſtitute of either Biſhop or Prieſt? Where was, all this while, the provident care, that our great Maſter and Redeemer ever had of his Church, which he had Eſtabliſhed by the Price of his Precious Blood? Where was that tender love, that he ever teſtified to his Endear'd Spouſe? Could he abandon his whole Church ſo ſoon after he had Inſtituted, and ſo firmly Founded it, that the Gates of Hell ſhould never prevail againſt it? What Chriſtian can, without a Sacred Horror, entertain a thought, of ſuch a general devaſtation, and deplorable deſolation?

But this being ſo obvious, could not but work the Church of *Rome* into an anxiety and ſedulous induſtry, to find a remedy; wherefore, to ſalve this Sore, they would never Reordain their Proſelites, that had deſerted the Communion of the *Greek* Church, and imbraced theirs; but on the contrary, in all occaſions, declared the Ordinations of the *Greek* Church to be valid; and conſequently granted to thoſe *Greeks*, that were now Incorporated into their Church, the free

uſe of all their Prieſtly Functions (though they had been created Prieſts according to the Rites of the *Greek* Church) and never attempted to Re-ordain them. By this they endeavor to evade this laſt imputation, which otherwiſe would lye heavy upon them.

But in plain terms, this evaaſion is no better, then a meer contradiction; for, How is it poſſible that the Ordination of the *Greeks* could be valid, without the Eſſentials of Ordination? which the *Roman* Church placeth in the Touching of the Holy Veſſels, with this Forme, *Accipe poteſtatem*, &c. Receive a power to offer Sacrifice, *&c.* for theſe the *Greeks* never uſed. You were as good tell me, That one may be truly and properly a Man, without either Body, or Reaſonable Soul, which are the Eſſentials of Man.

If you ſhould Reply, That there may be Two Eſſences of Ordination, ſo that each taken apart from the other, makes the Ordination valid. So when the *Greeks* Ordain, they uſe for Matter, the Impoſition of Hands, and

for

for Forme, theſe words, *Divina gratia*, &c. "The Divine Grace, which al-"ways heals that which is infirm, and "ſupplies that which is defective, pro-"motes this moſt holy Deacon to be a "Prieſt. By this Matter and Forme, the *Greeks* do validly confer the Or-der of Prieſthood: And when the *Romaniſts* Ordain, they do the like by their peculiar Matter and Forme. So that neither is rigorouſly neceſſary, but either may ſuffice. This Doctrine is very Paradoxical, for in ſubſtance it aſſerts, that one and the ſame thing may have two compleat and adequate Eſſences, ſpecifically, and generically different from each other, which is impoſſible, for a thing, and his ade-quate Eſſence is the ſame, and nothing can be ſpecifically, or generically dif-ferent from its ſelf.

But you'l ſay, Theſe are not two Eſſences of the ſame thing, but two different cauſes of the ſame effect. To ſolve this, I muſt diſtinguiſh between the Order it ſelf, and the Ordination; the Order is that Spiritual Power, which is given to the Ordained, by vertue of his Ordination, from whence

reſults the Order, together with its concomitant Supernatural effects, which are the Character and Sacramental Graces, that are inſeparable from it. The Ordination is made up of thoſe Actions and Words, which the Ordainer exerciſeth, and applyeth to the Ordained, ſo that the Ordination participates more of the nature of a cauſality, then of a cauſe. And the whole Eſſence of this Ordination, is the Matter and Forme inſtituted by *Chriſt*; for whatſoever was aſſum'd by the Original Inſtituter, and by him elevated, and impower'd to produce ſuch admirable, ſupernatural, and Sacramental effects, is the Eſſence of Ordination; So that Order is the Effect, and Ordination the Cauſe: wherefore, if you appoint new Eſſentials of Ordination, you not only grant two Cauſes of the ſame effect, but two Eſſences of the ſame thing, whereby you render Ordination, ſpecifically, and Eſſentially diſtinct from its ſelf. And becauſe none but an Omnipotent Power, can raiſe Natural Cauſes to ſuch vigor and energy, as to produce ſuch extraordinary effects; therefore that Matter and Forme which *Chriſt* hath

hath Inſtituted to this end, is the total Eſſence of Ordination. And herein the *Greeks* have the advantage, for they ever uſed the Impoſition of Hands, with the Forme above mentioned; which the Primitive Church received from the Apoſtles, and they from *Chriſt*; ſo the *Greeks* are ſure, that their Ordination hath a legal and valid Inſtitution: But where ſhall we find another adequate Eſſence of Ordination, by Divine Inſtitution? That of the Church of *Rome* hath no ſuch Prerogative, for we know its Origine, and have ſcan'd its Pedigree, whereby we find, that there is nothing but Human Autority to authoriſe it, which hath no proportion to ſuch wonderful effects which are out of the reach of Nature, and none but an Omnipotent Power can produce. Hence we groundedly conclude, that there is but one valid Ordination, which hath but one certain, and determinate Nature, and Eſſencc, neither is there any power upon Earth that can add to it, or take from it. So that in vain you aſſign the Touching of the Veſſels, with its Forme, for a ſecond, total, and adequate Eſſence of Ordination.

For

For all Antiquity was a ſtranger to this, the *Apoſtles* never heard of it, *Chriſt* never mentioned it neither by word nor action. Who then dares obtrude this as belonging to the Eſſence of Ordination, which is of Divine Right, as all Sacraments are? Certainly none will attempt it, but ſuch whoſe ambition prompts them to intrench upon Divine Right, and God it here upon Earth, not knowing, or not acknowledging that their power is limited, and confin'd within its certain bounds.

Beſides, were there two Formes of Ordination, one Inſtituted by Divine Autority, the other by Human, and both valid; by the ſame Rule you might inſtitute Two hundred, yea, every Dioceſs might have one peculiar to it ſelf; there is no more difficulty for the Third, then there was for the Second, nor for the Fourth, then the Third, and ſo of all the reſt. Wherefore if ſuch a power were delegated to meer Humanes, What a confuſion might they bring into the Church? which would be the ground of Diſcord, and Diſſention, for one Biſhop might contend with another, whoſe Ordination was beſt.

Having

Having thus proved the *Invalidity of Ordination*, according to the Present *Roman Pontifical*, and General Approbation of that Church; I shall now imploy my endeavors to solve the Objections which may be proposed in vindication thereof.

SECT. V.

SECT. VI.

An Anſwer to the Objections Propoſed by the Doctors of the Church of Rome, *againſt the* Invalidity *of their* Ordination.

THe *Roman* Divines, who earneſtly endeavor to compoſe this difficulty, find ſo much arduity in it, that they cannot agree among themſelves; but what expedient one finds out, as accommodated to this end, another diſapproves, and ſo with great anxiety, they caſt about, by ſeveral windings, and turnings, to compoſe the Difference between both Churches; but, in the execution, they impugne each other, and, by this means, divide themſelves into ſeveral Claſſes. Whereof I ſhall here give you an account.

The moſt conſiderable Party, as well for number, as for autority and reputation, are thoſe who abſolutely exclude all Impoſition of Hands, from the Eſſentials of Ordination, and place the whole

whole Eſſence thereof in Touching the Holy Veſſels, with the Forme accommodated thereunto. And indeed, this is generally received in the Church of *Rome*, as an undoubted Truth, and practiſed as ſuch. This is conformable to the Doctrine of the Council of *Florence*, and Pope *Gregory* the 9th, which I have cited in the beginning of the Fourth *Section*. This Opinion needs no Anſwer, for the Authors hereof are ſo far from reconciling both Churches, that they Unchurch both: and inſtead of ſolving the difficulty, they ſink under the burthen thereof. They deſtroy the *Greek* Church, by denying the Impoſition of Hands to be Eſſential to Ordination, which the *Greeks* ever uſed as the only Eſſential Matter thereof. They deſtroy the *Latines*, by relying wholly upon the Touching of the Veſſels, and the Forme annexed, as the only Eſſential Matter and Forme of Ordination, excluding all other, and yet this Matter and Forme are wholly uncapable of giving any validity to the Order of Prieſthood, becauſe they want the Eſſence, the very life and ſoul of being Inſtrumental to Ordination, which is the Divine

Some of the *Authors* of this Opinion I have cited in the *Fourth Section*.

Divine Inſtitution, as I have manifeſtly proved in the precedent *Section.*

A Second Objection: The Divine Inſtitutor of the Order of Prieſthood, did not determine the ſpecifical Matter and Forme thereof, but only in general, that the Church ſhould appoint ſome ſenſible Matter, and ſome Forme of Words, whereby to ſignifie the collation of Order by their application. So that here is a latitude in *Chriſt's* Inſtitution, and a Power left to the Church to determine what particular Matter and Forme, ſhe ſhould think fit, and by this Power the Church may alter the Matter and Forme of Order at her pleaſure; ſhe may abrogate what was before in uſe, and Inſtitute a new Matter and Forme, and the Order will ſtill be valid. So *Iſambertus*, the Kings Profeſſor of *Divinity* at *Paris*, Treating at large of the Sacrament of Order, *Diſput.* 3. *art.* 3. his words are theſe; *Chriſtus Dominus inſtituendo Ordines, determinavit tantum eorum materias in genere, nimirum, ut ea eſſet legitima cujuſlibet Ordinis materia, quæ exiſtens ſenſibilis, ſui Traditione debitè & ſufficienter facta, tam ex*

parte

parte Miniſtri, quam intentionis, ſignificaret tunc de facto poteſtatem tali Ordini propriam dari ei qui materiam iſtam ſenſibilem, ſeu ſignum iſtud ſenſibile, acciperet in ſua Ordinatione; particularem autem iſtius ſigni determinationem, ſeu imponere, & veluti affigere ſignificationem practicam illius poteſtatis, huic vel illi rei ſenſibili in particulari reliquit faciendam Eccleſiæ, prout, & quando illa judicaret eſſe conveniens. Our Lord Chriſt *Inſtituting Orders, did only determine their Matter in General, which being ſenſible, duly and ſufficiently apply'd, as well in reference to the Miniſter, as the Intention, might ſignifie then in effect, the power proper to that Order to be given to him, that in his Ordination ſhould receive this ſenſible Matter, or Sign. But to determine this Sign in particular, and to Impoſe, and as it were affix to it a Practical Signification of that Power given to this or that Senſible Thing in Particular, he hath left to be done by the Church, when, and how ſhe ſhould judge it convenient.*

And having Proved out of the *Conſtitutions* of *Clement*, and the *Fourth Council* of *Carthage*, That the Impoſition

tion of Hands by the Biſhop, and the aſſiſting Prieſts uſed in the beginning of Ordination, was formerly the Eſſential Matter of Prieſthood, he adds, *Igitur cum hoc noſtro tempore, hæc Impoſitio manuum ſit tantum accidentalis; & illa poſterior, quæ fit à ſolo Epiſcopo ſimul dicente ei quem Ordinat; Accipe Spiritum ſanctum. Quorum*, &c. *ſit nunc Eſſentialis, ut ſupra oſtendimus, aliqua mutatio eſt facta per Eccleſiam in iſta materia Ordinum. Therefore, ſince in this our time, this Impoſition of Hands is only accidental, and that laſt which is performed, only by the Biſhop, ſaying to him whom he Ordains*, "Receive "the Holy Ghoſt: whoſe ſins, *&c. is Eſſential, as I have ſhewn above, ſome change is made by the Church in this matter of Orders.* Thus he. The ſame ſaith *Gammacheus de Sacramento Ordinis, Cap. 4. Hallerius, S. Bonaventura. Prepoſitus Atrebas de materia & forma Ordinationis, n. 109.*

Lugo D. 2. de Sacramentis in genere, S. 5. n. 85.

There are Three Reaſons that this Objection is grounded on. The firſt is, becauſe the Church hath changed the matter of Subdeaconſhip, which was formerly conferr'd by the Impoſi-

tion

tion of Hands, but now by the Ordination and Practiſe of the Church, that Impoſition of Hands doth not at all belong to the Eſſence of Subdeaconſhip. *Secondly*, Clandeſtine Marriage was ever valid before the Council of *Trent*, but now is rendred invalid by that Council. *Thirdly*, The *Apoſtles* Confirmed by Impoſition of Hands without Unction; but now, if the Unction be omitted, the Confirmation is invalid.

To this Objection, my firſt Anſwer is, That it is all *gratis dictum*, it is ſaid without ground. It is *mera petitio principii*. They aſſume for proofe that which is to be proved. The thing in queſtion is, Whether the Church hath Power to Repeal, Alter, or Change, that which *Chriſt* hath Inſtituted in matter of Ordination? This Objection contends, that the Church hath done it, in Ordination, Matrimony, and Confirmation. I grant, the Church hath done it *de Facto*, but not *de Jure*: That is, it hath by its Ordination, and Practiſe, endeavored to violate Divine Right, but neither legally nor validly, as we have already proved. It is not that which is done at *Rome*, that muſt

Regulate our Belief, but that which is well and regularly done. So *Durandus*, *in* 4. *diſt.* 13. *q.* 3. telling us, That the cuſtom of the Prieſt-Cardinals, joyntly Celebrating with the Pope, was not in his time obſerved. *Et ſi obſervaretur, non eſſet neceſſarium credere quod benè fieret, quia ſecundùm Hieronimum, non quod fit Romæ, ſed quod fieri debet, attendendum eſt.* And if that cuſtom ſhould be obſerved at *Rome*, it would not be neceſſary to believe, that it were well done; for according to *Hierome:* not that which is done at *Rome*, but that which ought to be done, muſt be obſerved, ſaith *Durand.* As for Subdeaconſhip, Matrimony, and Confirmation, they all contain the ſame difficulty with this. Certain it is, that the Church of *Rome* (as much as in her lies) hath made a change in the Matter and Forme of her pretended Sacraments; and as certain it is, that ſhe hath done it illegally, and invalidly, as having No power, autority, or commiſſion to alter, change, or abrogate the Conſtitutions of *Chriſt*, which are of Divine Right, and eſpecially in our caſe, where meer Natural Creatures are elevated to produce ſupernatural

pernatural effects, which is peculiar to an Omnipotent Power, as is clearly proved in the precedent *section*.

My Second Answer is, That according to the Doctrine of this Objection, we must admit in the Divine Understanding, confus'd and imperfect acts, such are those which represent Universals, or Objects in General, which the *Philosophers* call *Universale*; and by such Acts a Created Understanding: *cognoscit plura non cognita pluralitate*; that is, an Act of Human Understanding, represents a nature common to Many, but doth not represent the plurality, nor the differences between them, and so by a distinction made by the Understanding, that Metaphysical formality which is common to many, is separated, and distinguisht from the difference that is between them, and yet they are really identify'd; this is proper to Human Understanding, and to Angelical, in such Objects as Angels know by forrain species, which are imperfect, but not in those that are known by their proper species, because these species produce perfect acts, that represent the Object as it is, which, of it self, admits no such distinction, but

is indiviſible. Now, to attribute to God ſuch confuſed, abſtractive, and imperfect notions of Objects, is to deſtroy his Omniſcience, which can admit of no imperfection, and ſo conſequently this Doctrine would Ungod him. Wherefore the Divine Intellect hath for its Object, all thoſe particulars, with all their niceſt differences, that are contained under thoſe heads that we call Generals, all which he repreſents, as they are in themſelves, with all their differences, by a cleer intuitive, and comprehenſive act. The reaſon is, becauſe God uſeth no ſpecies, no, nor acts diſtinct from himſelf; his Eſſence is his act, and ſpecies alſo, which hath a reference to all things that are poſſible, and hence he perfectly comprehends them all in their particulars and individuals, and therefore cannot repreſent a general prædicate ſo as to preſcind it from the differential formality, for this would argue imperfection. Now ſince the Will of God is regulated by his underſtanding, he can make no decree by way of Inſtitution of a Sacrament, to elevate ſuch or ſuch ſenſible ſigns in general, to produce ſupernatural effects, except he fixeth it upon ſome

ſome determinate particulars, becauſe the Underſtanding repreſents no ſuch generals, without the determinate particular differences, for *nihil volitum quin præcognitum*, the Will can have no Object, but what the Underſtanding repreſents; the Underſtanding of God repreſents no General without particulars, therefore the Will cannot decree an extraordinary concurſe to a General without determining the particulars; for otherwiſe God would determine himſelf, by his Decree, to give an extraordinary concurſe to he knew not what, but the Church muſt afterwards determine him; which is a conceit very unworthy of the infinite perfection of Gods Underſtanding and Will. Hence it is manifeſt, that the Matter and Forme of Sacraments can never be capacitated to produce ſuch wonderful and ſupernatural effects, except the Divine Decree paſs upon them in particular, to enable them to it, by his concomitant and extraordinary aſſiſtance.

But it may be alleaged, that without affiixing any obſcurity or imperfection to the Divine Acts, a Power may be left to the Church to determine ſome

one of thoſe matters, which the Underſtanding of God repreſents diſtinctly, with all their particular differences, and Regulates his Decree by the Churches Determination.

I Anſwer, That in effect this is no other then to Aſſert, That *Chriſt* hath Commiſſion'd the Church to Inſtitute Sacraments; for here are no limits preſcribed, but they are left to the whole latitude of any ſenſible Matter. And I demand, Whether any Divine dare aſſert, That the Church hath Power to change the Eſſential Matter of Baptiſm, or Euchariſt, for any other ſpecifically diſtinct from what is now in uſe? if not, What ground is there to aſſert ſuch a Power in the Church, in reference to one Sacrament more than another? Beſides, in this particular matter of Inſtituting Sacraments, ſuch a ſubordination of Gods Decrees to Human determination, derogates from the dignity of *Chriſt* as Redeemer, for he alone, without any Human Concurrence, is the Sole Inſtitutor of Sacraments, who, without Mans help, hath perfected the Work of our Redemption.

My

My third Anſwer is, That according to this Doctrine, the Church of *Rome* would have a power to Inſtitute Sacraments; for the Eſſence of each Sacrament conſiſts preciſely in the Matter and Forme, ſo that the Inſtitutor muſt appoint and determine what ſhall be the Matter and Forme of each Sacrament, which in effect is nothing elſe but the Sacrament it ſelf, which conſiſts only of theſe two Eſſential parts, impowered to produce ſuch effects as are peculiar to each Sacrament. But you will ſay, It is not the Church but *Chriſt*, that enables them to produce the Sacramental effects, by the Churches determination. It is well that the Church will admit of *Chriſt*, to be a Conſtituter with it; but yet the Church ſtill retains the *rectum*, which is the viſible, or ſenſible ſign, and contains the whole Eſſence of the Sacrament, and leaves to *Chriſt* only the *obliquum*, which is to do the work intended by it. But where was this Divinity ever Taught, to ſeparate the parts of Inſtitution of Sacraments, ſo as that one part ſhould be Human, and the other

Divine? which ſtill makes the Church a joynt Inſtitutor with *Chriſt*, and ſo, as that the Church hath the greateſt hand in it, for the Church Orders, Appoints, and Determines all, and *Chriſt* is to be ready at the Churches beck, to execute what ſhe appoints; as though the Omnipotent Power of the Divine Word were ſubſervient to the Church: for it is the powerful hand of *Chriſt* that elevates the ſenſible Signs to produce Sacramental effects, which are out of the reach of nature. But the Church determines what the Signs ſhall be, and ſummons the Divine Words Omnipotency, when and where to elevate them, and ſo ſhe hath the greateſt ſhare in the Inſtitution of Sacraments. 'Tis ſtrange, how ſuch a Thought could find admittance into any true Chriſtians underſtanding, to deveſt *Chriſt* of this Prerogative, and give it the *Roman Church*, which ſo much derogates from the high Power and Wiſdom of the Incarnate Word.

My

My Fourth *Anſwer* is grounded on Autority. And firſt I begin with the Council of *Trent*, in theſe words, *Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis, non fuiſſe omnia, à Jeſu Chriſto Domino noſtro Inſtituta*, &c. *Anathema ſit. If any one ſhall ſay, that the Sacraments of the New Law, were not all Inſtituted by Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, let him be Accurſed.* St. *Thomas* of *Aquine*, their great Divine, ſaith, *In Sacramentis novæ legis quibus homines Sanctificantur, oportet uti rebus ex Divina Inſtitutione determinatis. In the Sacraments of the New Law, by which Men are Sanctify'd, it is neceſſary to uſe things, that by Divine Inſtitution are determined.* Conſonant to this is the teſtimony of *Bellarmine*, in theſe words, *Res certæ, & determinatæ ab ipſo Deo, in Sacramentis eſſe debent. Things certain, and determined by God himſelf, muſt be uſed in the Sacraments.* And again, ſaith he, *Non ſolum res, ſed etiam verba, in Sacramentis novæ legis à Deo determinatæ ſunt; ut non liceat quidquam immutare. Not only the things* (ſaith he) *but alſo the words, in the Sacraments of the New Law, are determin'd*

Trident. Seſs. 7. Can. 1.

Aquinas, *3 Part. q. 60. ar. 5. corpore.*

Bellarminus, *L. 1. de Sacramentis in genere, C. 21.*

Ibid.

determin'd by God; ſo that it is not lawful to change any thing. All this is confirmed and atteſted by *Suarez*, that great Divine, whoſe Autority bears ſuch ſway in the Church of *Rome*; who firſt lays his Ground-work in theſe words, *Omnia Sacramenta quæ conſtant in uſu, conſtant rebus, & verbis, ſeu materia, & forma, tanquam ex partibus quibus componuntur. All Sacraments which conſiſt in uſe, contain things, and words, or matter, and forme, as parts whereof they are compoſed.* And afterwards he adds theſe words, *Dico* 1. *materias & formas Sacramentorum, determinatas eſſe ex Chriſti Domini Inſtitutione, & eo modo quo definitæ ſunt, eſſe neceſſarias ad Sacramenta conficienda. Firſt, I aſſert* (ſaith *Suarez*) *that the Matters and Forms of Sacraments are determined, by the Inſtitution of* Chriſt *our Lord; and in that manner as they are defin'd, they are neceſſary to the validity of the Sacraments.* But this is not all, for of this very Opinion he adds theſe words, *Eſt communis Theologorum, & abſolute loquendo, eſt de fide. This is the common Doctrine of the Divines, and abſolutely ſpeaking,*

Suarez 3 *Part. To.* 3. *D.* 2. *S.* 2. *citans, D. Thomam.*

Ibid. *S.* 3.

ſpeaking, it is an Article of Faith. Ile adds one Text more, out of *Suarez*, becauſe his Autority is ſo renowned. In the *Fourth Section* he thus declares his Opinion, *Si mutatio materiæ aut formæ, eſſentialis, ſeu ſubſtantialis ſit, nullum efficitur Sacramentum. If any change be made in the Matter or Forme, that is Eſſential, or Subſtantial, it renders the Sacrament void, and ineffectual.* Hence I conclude, that the Authors and Abetters of the Doctrine contained in the Objection, do not only impugne the common Opinion of Divines, but they alſo erre in matter of Faith, as *Suarez* obſerves. Ibid. *S.* 4.

And it is to be obſerved, that all theſe Autorities agree in this, That *Chriſt* not only Inſtituted, but alſo Determined the Matter and Forme of all Sacraments, which the Authors of this Objection deny.

To this Ile annex the Judgment of *Maldonatus*, a Famous Divine of the Jeſuits, whoſe words are theſe, *Impoſitio manuum non eſt habenda tanquam* Maldonatus, *Tom.* 2. *de Sacramentis, Tract. de Ordine, q.* 3. *part.* 2.

quam ceremonia non neceſſaria, ſed tanquam pars Eſſentialis Sacramenti; idque videtur tenendum fide Catholica. Primum, quia in Scriptura ubicunque fit mentio de Ordinatione, declaratur per impoſitionem manuum. Et videtur mihi eſſe temerarium, ſcripturam deſerere, & conſectari chymeras, id eſt, rationes naturales. Secundò quia veterem Eccleſiam nunquam ordinaſſe, ſine impoſitione manuum, ex omnibus autoribus antiquis perſpicuum eſt. De traditione autem calicis & hoſtiæ, nulla eſt mentio apud illos. Tertiò, quia videtur durum nimis eſſe, ceremoniam quam nobis perſpicuè tradunt Apoſtoli, excludere à natura Sacramenti, & inducere illam, de qua nulla mentio fit in Scriptura. In Engliſh thus:

The Impoſition of hands is not to be eſteemed, as a Ceremony, not neceſſary, but as an Eſſential part of the Sacrament, and this ought to be held as an Article of Faith.

Firſt, *Becauſe in Scripture, whereſoever mention is made of Ordination, it*

it is declar'd by the Impoſition of hands; and it ſeems to me temerarious, to deſert the Scripture, and follow Fictions, that is, Natural Reaſons.

Secondly. *Becauſe it is evident by all Antient Writers, that the Primitive Church never Ordained without the Impoſition of hands; but they make no mention of delivering the Chalice and the Hoaſt.*

Thirdly. *Becauſe it ſeems too hard to exclude from the nature of a Sacrament, a Ceremony, which is clearly delivered to us by the Apoſtles, and, to induce that, of which there is no mention made in the Scripture.* Thus *Maldonatus.*

'Tis well that ſome of our Antagoniſts cannot be ſwayed neither by hope nor fear, nor any way deterr'd from uttering Truth. He tells us, That it is an Article of Faith, that the Impoſition of hands is Eſſential to Ordination, and that it is a temerity to deny it, and he proves both by ſolid

ſolid Arguments. So that they who adhere to the practiſe, and perſwaſion of the Church of *Rome*, muſt, to defend this Doctrine, deſert both *Scripture* and *Tradition*.

SECT. VII.

SECT. VII.

The Solution of other Objections againſt the ſame Doctrine.

A Third Objection endeavors a Reconciliation, by joyning the delivery of the Inſtruments or Veſſels, and their Forme, with the laſt Impoſition of hands, and this Forme, *Accipe Spiritum ſanctum*, &c. So that of theſe two Matters they make one entire Matter; and of theſe two Forms, they frame one entire and adequate Forme. Yet ſo, as that by touching the Veſſels with this Forme, *Accipe poteſtatem*, &c. they affirm the Ordained to receive the Order of Prieſthood, with Power to Conſecrate and offer Sacrifice; and the Character to be thereby imprinted. But by the conſequent impoſition of hands, the Ordained receives a Power only to forgive or retain ſins, as the Forme of words expreſſeth. So *Becanus*, *Part* 3. *Theologiæ*, *Cap.* 26. *de Sacramento Ordinis*, *queſt.* 4. who uſes his utmoſt endeavor by this means, to maintain the Validity of

of Ordination according to the preſent practice of the Church of *Rome*, yet ſo, as not to draw any prejudice upon the Ordination of the *Greek* Church, and other Chriſtian Congregations, whoſe Ordinations the Church of *Rome* ever declared valid. But the Council of *Florence* ſeems to obſtruct his deſign, by aſſigning no other Eſſentials of Ordination but the Tradition of the Veſſels, and their Forme, and here *Gamachæus*, above cited, in the precedent *Section*, *Cap.* 4. joyns his forces with *Becanus*, or rather *Becanus* with him. So alſo doth *Meratius*, *D* 7. *s.* 2. who, to the Autority of the Council of *Florence*, Anſwers; *Concilium non ſuſcepiſſe ex profeſſo declarandum accurate ſingulorum ordinum, materiam & formam totalem ac integram*, &c. *ſed ſolum per cujus rei Traditionem poteſtas ordinis conferetur. The Council* (ſaith *Meratius*) *did not undertake of purpoſe, to declare exactly, the total and adequate Matter and Forme of each order*, &c. *but only to declare what thoſe things were by whoſe Tradition the power of order was conferr'd.* And this Opinion *Iſamberus* alſo imbraces with avidity, as conceiving all helps little enough, in

in ſuch a hard conjuncture, and therfore joyns this Opinion with his own, ſpecify'd above in the Second Objection. St. *Bonaventure* holds the ſame, in 4 *d.* 7.*ar.*1.*q.*1.*&* 2. and before him *Alexander*, *p.*4.*Summe. q.* 9.*Memb.*1.*&*2.*ar.*2. where he diſtinguiſheth between that which *Chriſt* Ordained, and that which the Church Ordained, in theſe words, *Quæ enim ab homine Ordinata ſunt, ab homine poſſunt mutari, quæ autem à Deo inſtituta ſunt, non niſi dictante Deo debent mutari. Theſe things* (ſaith he) *that are Ordained by Man, may be changed by Man, but thoſe things that are Inſtituted by God, are not to be changed, but by Gods appointment.*

As to their Interpretation of the Council of *Florence*, I Anſwer, That it is is a meer ungrounded ſhift, for the Council gives not the leaſt hint of any ſuch ſenſe, but undertakes to aſſign the Eſſential matter of Prieſthood, and to that purpoſe, ſpecifies only the Tradition of the Veſſels, as the only Eſſential Matter, and mentions nothing elſe, which would be a meer deluſion, if the Council had judged any thing elſe to be Eſſential. But *Becanus* interprets it thus, *Nota, antiqua Concilia*

assignasse materiam à Christo Institutam ; Florentinum verò materiam assignasse quam Ecclesia introduxit. Note (saith *Becanus*) *that the Antient Councils assigned the matter Instituted by Christ ; but the Council of* Florence *specified the Matter that was introduced by the Church.* Be it so; then the Antient Councils assigned only the Imposition of hands, as the Essential Matter of Priesthood ; but the Council of *Florence*, in the time of those Fathers, signified the Tradition of the Vessels, and nothing else, as the only Essential Matter: So that neither the Antient, nor Modern Councils, ever joyned these two Matters together, as parts of the whole, by their own Confession. But hence it is plain, that the Church of *Rome* hath introduced a New Matter and Forme, which *Christ* never Instituted, and yet they hold it Essential. Now to their Argument.

My first Answer is, That this is a meer evasion to save them from Shipwrack. What ground have they, for patching up a Sacramental Matter with two such disparate, and heterogeneal pieces?

pieces? What time will they appoint to have the Character imprinted? What will this avail them, if it ſhould be all granted; for none of them will admit the Impoſition of Hands alone, with its Forme, to have a capacity to confer the Order of Prieſthood, and Imprint the Character, therefore they muſt declare the Ordination of the *Greeks* to be fruſtrate, who never uſed any other Matter then the Impoſition of Hands. But if this alone be ſufficient, Then what need is there of the Tradition of the Veſſels? Why ſhould theſe two parts, ſo different from each other, be conjoyned, if either of them apart were ſufficient?

My Second Anſwer is; That they could never have made a worſe choice then to joyn theſe two Matters and Formes together, in order to conſtitute the entire Eſſence of Ordination; for both the one and the other are Innovations; the one begun about Seven hundred years ſince; the other was introduced about Four hundred and fifty years ſince; ſo that neither was Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, neither recommended by the *Apoſtles*, neither

practiſed in the Church of God before the times ſpecified. From whence then can they derive their Validity?

My Third Anſwer is, That the laſt Impoſition of Hands with this Forme, *Accipe ſpiritum ſanctum*, &c. *Receive the Holy Ghoſt; whoſe ſins you forgive they are forgiven, whoſe ſins you retain, they are retained.* This, I ſay, can no way belong to the Eſſentials of Prieſthood, becauſe this Matter and Forme are applyed to none but thoſe that have before received the Order of Prieſthood, and have the Character Imprinted, which is manifeſt, becauſe they all ſaid Maſs, and Conſecrated with the Biſhop, before the application of this Matter and Forme, which is not performed till after they have all Received the Communion, immediately before the Poſt-Communion is Read; wherefore this Matter and Forme comes too late, to have any influence upon the Order of Prieſthood; but I ſhall not need ſpend time in the Proof of this; becauſe the Authors of this Objection grant it, and only make uſe of this Matter and Forme,

Forme, to confer the Power of Forgiving and Retaining ſins. Which being ſuppoſed, they muſt rely wholly upon the Tradition of the Veſſels, for conferring upon the Ordained the Spiritual Power of Prieſthood, and enabling him to Conſecrate the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, and to offer Sacrifice, and for Imprinting the Character, *&c.* all which, the touching of the Veſſels, with its Forme, can never accompliſh, becauſe here is nothing at all of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, no Impoſition of Hands doth any way concur to this. So that we have here the Power of Prieſthood conferr'd, with the Character, and yet without any Impoſition of Hands; and hereby this Opinion agrees with the Firſt Objection, which excludes all Impoſition of Hands; and therefore muſt of neceſſity condemn the *Greek* Church, who never uſe any other Matter of Ordination, then the Impoſition of Hands. And yet the main drift of theſe Objections is, to ſave the Validity of the *Greeks* Ordinations, ſo as not to deſtroy their own. And that the Power of Conſecrating the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* is the Principal

Act of Prieſthood, they all grant, and it is ſo aſſerted by *Albertus Magnus*. *The Act of Prieſts* (ſaith he) *is to Conſecrate the Body and Blood of* Chriſt: *and it is the Principal Act; the other is conſequent, which is, to Retain and Abſolve.*

Albert. Mag. L. 6. Theologiæ veritatis, C. 36.

A Fourth Objection: Nothing can be more ſignificant, nor more proportionable to the Function and chief Miniſtry of a Prieſt, then the delivering to him, in his Ordination, thoſe Veſſels wherein he is to Conſecrate, and Conſummate the Myſteries of the Euchariſt, which is the Principal and Subſtantial Act of his Prieſtly Office; and therefore nothing ſo fit, to be the Eſſential Matter of his Ordination. So likewiſe the Forme, clearly, and Explicitely ſignifieth the Order of Prieſthood to be conferr'd to the Ordained, by the application of this Matter and Forme, and therefore is moſt exactly accommodated to this preſent end.

I Anſwer, That it argues Temerity and Preſumption, for meer Men to prefer their judgments before the judgment

ment of the Word Incarnate, who knows and comprehends all things whose judgment and prudence is infinite, and consequently he best knew what was most significant, and most expedient for the Matter and Forme of such Mysteries, as he himself Instituted. And therefore, to reject that which *Christ* appointed, and substitute in lieu thereof the products of our own weak invention, under pretence that it is more accommodated to the Mystery then that, is too high an attempt; for hereby we devest *Christ* of his Omniscience, and consequently of his Divinity, by preferring our own Finite and Limited capacities, before the Illimited Perfections of *Christ*'s Understanding, which is very prepósterous and deordinate.

As to the Forme of words which they have introduced, to animate their adventitious Matter, lest their Reformation should remain incompleate: I Answer, That this Modern Forme, now in practice in the Church of *Rome*, to wit, *Receive a Power of offering Sacrifice as well for the Living as the Dead*, &c. is very different from the antient Forme

derived from the Apoſtles, which is this, *The Divine Grace, which always heals that which is infirm, and ſupplies that which is defective, promotes this holy Deacon to be a Prieſt.* Compare theſe two together, and you will find a ſubſtantial difference between them, that is Imperative, this Indicative; that gives Power of offering Sacrifice; this hath no ſuch expreſſion: That ſpecifies to whoſe benefit the Sacrifice ſhall accrue; this makes no mention at all to whoſe benefit it ſhould redound, *&c.* Theſe and other differences make thoſe two Forms very heterogeneal, and diſcrepating, when compared with each other.

But it may be alleag'd, That notwithſtanding theſe ſeeming Differences, yet, in effect, the two Forms are equivalent, and render the ſame ſenſe, only with this difference, that what the one contains implicitely, the other expreſſeth more particularly, and explicitely. The ſecond ſignifies Prieſthood conferr'd, which implies a power of exerciſing all the Functions and Miniſteries that properly belong to a Prieſt; among which is enumerated the power

of

of offering Sacrifice, which peculiarly belongs to a Prieſt. This therefore is tacitly contained, and involved under the ſignification of this Second Forme; and the firſt ſignifies more diſtinctly this ſelf-ſame thing, and no more. For the intention of the Sacrificator, is extrinſecal to the Sacrifice, for whether he offer it for the Living, or the Dead, or by way of Satisfaction, Propitiation, or Impetration for himſelf, or others, makes no change in the Sacrifice.

This latter part I admit; but, to the reſt I Anſwer, That the offering of Sacrifice in the Law of Grace, is not the only Function peculiar and proper to a Prieſt, becauſe the Adminiſtration of the Sacraments, Preaching, and Explaining the Word of God, *&c.* are Miniſteries belonging to the Office of Prieſts: all which are contained under the Second Forme, but wholly omitted in the Firſt, which only impowers the Ordained to offer Sacrifice, and limits his power to this alone, becauſe this Power is explicitely given him, and no mention made of any other; ſo that the Second Forme having a greater latitude, as comprehending all that is contained

contained under the notion of Prieſthood, and the Firſt Forme limited to one Function alone, it is manifeſt that this Firſt Forme, *peccat per defectum*, that it is deficient, for it doth not reach the compleate Power of Prieſthood, and the Second Forme being wholly omitted in the *Roman Pontifical*, the Ordination conſequently is Eſſentially defective.

Yet Independent of all this, they acknowledging the Original Matter and Forme to be valid: What neceſſity was there of Inſtituting this New Matter and Forme? Is it Chriſtian-like to be diffident of *Chriſt*'s Providence? as though the Supreame Power of our Benign Redeemer wanted Ability, or his Omniſcience were defective to know our wants; or his Infinite Goodneſs had not the Will to furniſh us with all neceſſaries conducing to our Eternal Bliſs. Is it poſſible that any underſtanding, though but meanly inſtructed with Reaſon, can conceive, that Human Providence, in theſe Supernatural Myſteries, can, in the leaſt manner, come in competition with that never failing Providence of *Chriſt* himſelf? They Teach, That the Matter and

Forme

Forme of all Sacraments, are ſo determin'd by Divine Inſtitution, *ut non liceat quidquam immutare*, that it is not lawful to change any thing, ſaith *Bellarmine*; and *Suarez* ſaith, *It is an Article of Faith.* See the *Authors*, for this, above, *Sect.* 6. in the Fourth Anſwer to the Second Objection; they alſo hold Ordination to be a Sacrament: *Si quis dixerit Ordinem ſive Sacram Ordinationem, non eſſe verè & propriè Sacramentum, à Chriſto Domino Inſtitutum*, &c. *Anathema ſit.* If any one ſhall ſay, That Order, or Ordination is not truely and properly a Sacrament, Inſtituted by *Chriſt* our Lord, let him be Accurſed, ſaith the Council of *Trent.* If therefore they ſtand to their own Principles, the change which they have made, in the Matter and Forme of Ordination, can be no leſs then a violation of Divine Right, which renders the Order of Prieſthood Invalid.

Bellarm. L. 1. de Sacram. in genere, C. 21.

Trident. Seſſ. 23. Can. 3.

But this is not all; for though their Modern Forme ſhould be equivalent to the Primitive Forme, yet if it be miſplaced, and not applyed to the Impoſition of Hands, which is the Original Matter, it cannot make one with it; and

ſo

ſo on this account, the Ordination will be Invalid. And in effect they have ſo diſmembred the parts of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, and ſo inverted the Order of them, that it is very remote from being the ſame thing it was. For though they uſe the Impoſition of Hands (which is the Original Matter) yet they apply not to it, the Original Forme, which they entirely omit; nay, they allow it no Forme at all, as it were in Contempt; the Ordainer, with Deep Silence only putting his hand upon the Head of him that is to be Ordained, not deeming it an Eſſential Matter of Order, but only as a preparative thereunto. And the Second Impoſition of Hands (which immediately follows the Firſt) hath no Forme, but a Precation, neither can it confer the Order of Prieſthood, becauſe the Forme which follows at a diſtance, and affects the Tradition of the Veſſels, expreſly ſignifies the Order then given, which would be a Sacrilegious Repetition, were it given before. Wherefore the Antient Forme being omitted, and the new one not applyed to the Original Matter, I conclude, that here is made an Eſſential Mutation deſtructive

ative of the Validity of Order.

A Fifth Objection, much like the former, is proposed by his Eminence, Cardinal *Lugo*, who disapproving all other ways of reconciling the Church of *Rome* with the *Greek* Church, in matter of Ordination, proposeth, as he conceives, a better expedient, in these words, *Verior ergo, & planior conciliandi modus est, quam supra insinuavimm: Ecclesiam Latinam retinuisse utique, priscum illum ritum ab Apostolis introductum, Ordinandi Sacerdotem per manus Impositionem, illam tamen materiam magis explicitam reddidisse, adjungendo traditionem panis & vini quod Græci non faciunt; ita ut ex manus Impositione, & Traditione panis & vini, fiat una integra materia magis explicita, cum forma quæ nunc profertur explicante potestatem solam ad sacrificândum. Postea vero adhibetur iterum alia manus impositio cum altera forma explicante potestatem ad Absolvendum. Wherefore a truer and a plainer way of Reconciliation is that which we have insinuated above, that the* Latin *Church hath indeed retained the Antient Rite introduced by the Apostles, of Ordaining a Priest by the Imposition of Hands, but hath rendred*

Lugo. D. 2. de Sacram. in genere, S. 5. n. 98.

dred it more explicite, by adding to it the Tradition of Bread and Wine, which the Greeks *do not practiſe; ſo that of the Impoſition of Hands, and Tradition of the Bread and Wine, there is made one entire Matter more explicite, with the Forme now in uſe, that expreſſeth only a power of Sacrificing. But afterwards there follows another Impoſition of Hands, with another Forme, expreſſing the Power of Abſolving.* Thus Cardinal *Lugo.* The ſame is held by *Gravina. De materia & forma Ordinis. D.* 2. *Sect.* 3. where he ſaith, That the Veſſels are implicitely contained in the Impoſition of Hands, wherefore the *Greeks* do implicitely, and virtually touch the Veſſels, but the *Latins* do it explicitely, and formally.

I Anſwer, That the ſo much deſired Reconciliation between the *Greeks* and the *Latines*, in reference to Ordination, will never be made, by the Doctrine of this Objection, which is grounded upon a falſe Principle, that the Touching the Veſſels is equivalently the Impoſition of Hands, and ſo virtually contained in it, which is repugnant to common ſenſe. For, What have the Veſſels to do with the Impoſition of Hands?

Hands? What analogy or ſimilitude is there between them? The Impoſition of Hands being the Action of the Ordainer, wherein the Ordained is but paſſively concerned. And the Touching the Veſſels is the proper Action of the Ordained. Now to prove the difference between them, we muſt have recourſe to the *ſpecificativa entium*, as the *Philoſophers* terme it; that is, by aſſigning the termes or correlatives, of their intrinſecal and Eſſential Relations, we may evidently deduce, what their Nature and Eſſence is. The Touching of the Veſſels is an action, whoſe origine and cauſe, is the Perſon of the Ordained. The Object or Term of the ſame action, is the Thing Touched, which are the Veſſels. The Impoſition of Hands, hath for its origine or cauſe, the Perſon of the Biſhop, who is the Ordainer; and for its object, or terme, the Perſon of the Ordained; ſo that the correlatives of the one, compared with the correlatives of the other, are as different, as the Veſſels are from the Perſon of the Ordained; and from this difference we evidently gather the like difference between the Touching the Veſſels, and the Impoſi-

tion

tion of Hands, by reaſon of the intrinſecal, and Eſſential habitude, and reference, which theſe actions have to their correlatives. But the Eſſence of the Veſſels, and the Perſon of the Ordained, are not only ſpecifically, but generically different from each other, the one being an Animate Creature, the principle of Vegetation, Senſation and Reaſon; the other only Inanimate Metals, deſtitute of Life, Vegetation, Senſation and Reaſon; which by the firſt notions of *Philoſophy*, argues a ſpecifical, and generical difference. And conſequently the Impoſition of Hands, and touching the Veſſels, are Eſſentially, and Subſtantially different from each other. And by this Diſcourſe, the ſame difference will reſult, whether you inſiſt upon the Veſſels, or the Subſtance of Bread and Wine, which they contain, for they are all Inanimate, and deſtitute of Life. So that the Touching of the Veſſels, and the Impoſition of Hands, are Eſſentially, and Subſtantially diſtinguiſht from each other, and conſequently the one can neither formally, nor virtually, nor equivalently, nor implicitly, contain the other.

And.

And yet that the Order of Prieſthood is a Sacrament, we have their univerſal conſent; The Council of *Trent* defines it, to be truely and properly a Sacrament Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, and layes a Curſe upon thoſe that ſhall deny it, as we ſee above. What then remains? but that in the Eſſentials of an acknowledg'd Sacrament, Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, they have made a ſubſtantial and Eſſential Mutation. And yet they cannot deny, that whatſoever is Inſtituted by *Chriſt* himſelf, is Sacred, 'tis *Juris Divini*, of Divine Right, and therefore not to be altered by the wiſeſt of Mankind. And to attempt a change in things of Divine Right, implyes, either an imputation of Ignorance in *Chriſt*, or elſe a diſtruſt of his Prudence and Providence, as if we were not content with what *Chriſt* hath Ordained for us, but we muſt preſume to Reform his Ordinances, Detracting one thing, and Subſtituting another, to Reform, or Compleat the Work of the Omniſcient.

Trid. Seſs. 23. *Can.* 3.

A Sixth Objection; That the Order of Prieſthood was rightly and validly conferr'd in the Antient Church, as well

well by the *Latines*, as the *Greeks*, no Man doubts; but the Church of *Rome* retains all that was then in uſe, as appears above, by the *Rituals*, *Sect.* 2. *Ca.* 3. and in particular, the Impoſition of Hands then uſed, with a Deprecatory Forme, which is the Second Impoſition of Hands, contained in the *Roman* Ritual, with that Antient Prayer, to which, in the old Rituals is prefixt this Title, *Conſecratio Presbyteri:* the Conſecrating of a Prieſt, whereby Prieſthood was formerly conferr'd; wherefore the Church of *Rome*, uſing this Matter and Forme in the beginning of Ordination, wants none of the Eſſentials, and therefore her Ordination is valid. So *Morinus*, *De Sacris Ordinationibus*, *Part.* 3. *Exercitatione* 7. *C.* 1. *&* 2. which he proves, by refelling the Opinions of other Authors, who place the Eſſence of Ordination in any of the other two Impoſitions of Hands, or in the Tradition of the Inſtruments; which in theſe preſent circumſtances, is no proofe at all, eſpecially to one, who impugnes them all. For this is no Argument; their Opinions are falſe; *ergo* mine is true. How eaſily is it Anſwered? that they

are

are all falſe, both his and theirs, except the contrary be proved. But he endeavors to prove his Opinion by the Autority of the Council of *Trent*, *Seſs.* 14. *C.* 3. where the Council Orders the Miniſters of Extreame Unction to be only Biſhops, *aut Sacerdotes ab ipſis rite Ordinatos per Impoſitionem manuum Presbyterii: or elſe Prieſts by them Ordained by the Impoſition of the Hands of the Presbytery*: which refers to none but the Second Impoſition of Hands, according to the *Roman Pontifical*; for, in this alone, the Biſhop joyns his Right Hand with the other Prieſts upon the head of the Ordained.

In this Opinion *Morinus* is ſingular, for I find no *Author* that holds it but himſelf, neither is it probable, that the Validity of Ordination in the Church of *Rome*, muſt rely upon the Autority of one ſingle Author, who is a better *Hiſtorian* then *Divine*, in oppoſition to all other *Authors*.

Wherefore my Firſt Anſwer is, That this Impoſition of Hands, which *Morinus* inſiſts upon, cannot validly confer the Order of Prieſthood, for want of an intention in the Miniſter to confer it hereby; For no Biſhop that Ordains can prudently intend to Ordain by this Impoſition of Hands only, neither can the Church intend it: *Firſt*, Becauſe there is but one Author that holds it, all the Divines being wholly againſt it, aſſerting it to be only an accidental Ceremony, preparative to the collation of Order, but not at all belonging to the Eſſence of it; For the greateſt part of Divines, and common perſwaſion of the Church of *Rome*, admit no Impoſition of Hands at all, as belonging to the ſubſtance of Ordination; but place the whole Eſſence thereof in the Touching the Inſtruments, and their Forme. Others that allow to the Impoſition of Hands a partial concurrence, together with the Tradition of the Veſſels, yet none of them make choice of this Impoſition of Hands, but they all attribute this partial vertue to the Third Impoſition of Hands, after Communion, with this Forme,

Forme, *Accipe Spiritum Sanctum, quorum remiseritis*, &c. *Receive the Holy Ghost, whose sins*, &c. *Secondly*, Becauſe, if the Church, or the Ordainer, ſhould intend Ordination of Prieſts to be conferr'd by this Impoſition of Hands, and the Prayer that accompanys it, as the total and compleat Eſſence, and ſubſtance thereof, they would thereby render the exhibiting of the Inſtruments and their Forme, wholly uſeleſs, which would reflect upon the Churches Prudence and Diſcretion, in introducing them; for no other neceſſity of this ſuperinduction, contrary to the conſtant practiſe of Antiquity, can be groundedly aſſign'd, but to be an adequate, or a partial cauſe of Prieſthood.

My Second Anſwer is, That the Forme which accompanyeth the tendering of the Inſtruments, doth ſo plainly, ſo expreſly, and ſo explicitely ſignifie, the Order of Prieſthood to be thereby conferr'd, that no Ordainer, that is in his right wits, can any way doubt of it, or call it in queſtion, but that the Church, by adding this Matter, and Forme, intended thereby to

confer to the Ordained the power of offering Sacrifice (wherein they place the Eſſence of Prieſthood) if then this power were given the Ordained before, by that Second Impoſition of Hands, the Ordainer (if he underſtands what he ſays) muſt, *volens, nolens*, confer that power over again, to the ſame Ordained; which is a Sacriledge; neither can the Church, who introduced it, avoid this inconvenience. For Reordination was, by a never interrupted Tradition prohibited in the Church of God. So in the Canons of the Apoſtles, *Si quis Epiſcopus, vel Presbyter, vel Diaconus, Secundam Ordinationem ab alio receperit, deponatur & ipſe, & qui Ordinavit*, &c. *If any Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, do receive from another a Second Ordination, let him be depoſed, and he that Ordained him.* The ſame is Taught by the Council of *Trent*, in theſe words, *Si quis dixerit, tribus Sacramentis, Baptiſmo ſcilicet, Confirmatione & Ordinatione, non imprimi Characterem in anima, hoc eſt ſignum quoddam Spirituale, & indelebile, unde ea iterari non poſſunt, Anathema ſit. If any one ſhall ſay, That in Three Sacraments, namely Baptiſme, Confirmation, and Ordination*

Canon. Apoſt. 68.

Trid. Seſs. 7. Can. 9.

on, there is not a Character imprinted in the Soul, that is, a certain Spiritual, and indeleble ſign, by means whereof they cannot be reiterated, let him be Accurſed. St. Cyprian, *de ablutione pedum*, cites an antient Author ſpeaking thus, *Nemo Sacros Ordines ſemel datos renovat iterum*, &c. *quia contumelia eſſet Spiritui Sancto ſi evacuari poſſet quod ille ſanctificat*, &c. *None renews again Holy Orders that are once given, becauſe it would be a contumely to the Holy Ghoſt, if that ſhould be evacuated, which he hath Sanctified.* But I need not inſiſt upon this, becauſe they all grant it.

Hence it inſues, That though the *Roman* Ritual ſhould contain all the Eſſentials of Ordination, yet this would not evince the Validity of it. *Firſt*, Becauſe they reject that which is Eſſential, as a meer circumſtantial Ceremony inductive to Prieſthood, and conſequently have no intention to confer the Order by it. Which intention is a neceſſary condition, *ſine qua non*, without which, no Order can be Validly conferr'd, as they all Teach, and is defined by the Council of *Florence*, as you may ſee above in the *Fourth Section*, and the Second Prooſe. *Se-*

condly, Becauſe they have introduced a new Matter and Forme, never Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, nor ever mentioned by the Apoſtles, nor the Primitive Church, by which they intend the Collation of Prieſthood; Wherefore ſhould the Prieſtly Power be conferr'd, by that Second Impoſition of Hands, then in every Ordination there would be a Sacrilegious attempt of Reordaining.

A Seventh Objection: Though the Church of *Rome* approves of the Tradition of the Veſſels, with its proper Forme, yet it ſo allows it, as not to exclude the Impoſition of Hands, and therefore the Ordination is Valid, and no way repugnant to *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution; for this additional Matter and Forme, is but a thing indifferent to the other parts of Ordination, and therefore cannot be prejudicial to them; for, as *Gratian* obſerves, *Utile per inutile non vitiatur*; *A uſeleſs addition cannot vitiate that which is uſeful.* Wherefore, according to the Council of *Trent*, *Agnoſcens ſancta mater Eccleſia ſuam in Adminiſtratione Sacramentorum autoritatem. The Holy Mother, the Church, well knowing the power ſhe*

Tridem, Seſs. 21. C. 3.

ſhe hath in the Adminiſtration of Sacraments, ſhe may add, diminiſh, or alter, as incident occaſions and circumſtances ſhall require, ſtill retaining the Eſſentials.

To this I Reply, That this Objection is already Anſwered, in the Solution of the precedent Objection. Only this layes an Aſperſion upon the Church for introducing into the *Ritual* a needleſs Addition, though in effect it is deſtructive of the Validity of Ordination, by rendring the Eſſentials uſeleſs, and drawing from them the intention of Ordaining, as is above declared. But if this Addition be not Eſſential, Why is the power of offering Sacrifice expreſt in it? Surely the Council of *Florence*, and Pope *Gregory* the Ninth, thought it Eſſential, as you may ſee above, *ſect.* 4. And indeed, that which is added, is uſed as Eſſential, and that which *Chriſt* Inſtituted, is rejected as Circumſtantial, which vitiates the Ordination.

An Eighth Objection: The ground of this Diſcourſe, againſt the Validity of Ordination, according to the *Roman* Ritual

Ritual, depends upon that Opinion, which allows to the Sacraments a Phyſical influence, into the ſupernatural effects thereof; for, great difficulty is made, how Natural Cauſes can produce Supernatural Effects, on pretence, that none but an Omnipotent Power can elevate them, *per potentiam obedientialem*, to render Nature proportionable, to that which is above Nature: wherefore admitting only a Moral Cauſality, which is a probable opinion, held and maintained by many Divines, this difficulty will ceaſe, for then the Church may Ordain, and determine the Matters and Formes of Sacraments, without communicating to them, that Supernatural Power of producing Phyſically and really ſuch like Sacramental effects, as are above Nature.

My Firſt Anſwer is, That many Grave and Learned Divines, maintain, That the Sacraments do Really and Phyſically produce their Supernatural Effects; and they prove it by ſubſtantial Reaſons, wherefore this Opinion, both by Autority, and Reaſon, claimes the preference, eſpecially as being more conformable to the expreſſions of the Councils,

Councils, who Teach, That the Sacraments contain Grace, that is, virtually, which ſignifies a power to produce it, and alſo, that they confer Grace *ex opere operato*, &c. that is, the Sacraments by their due application, confer Grace to the Receiver; through the power and vertue wherewith they are indued, by Divine Inſtitution, which is diſtinct from that Grace which is produced *ex opere operantis*, that correſponds to the piety and devotion of the Receiver. So the Council of *Trent*, *Si quis dixerit per ipſa novæ legis Sacramenta, ex opere operato, non conferri gratiam*, &c. *Anathema ſit. If any one ſhall ſay, that by the Sacraments of the New Law, there is not Grace confer'd, which proceeds from the vertue of the Sacrament, let him be Accurſed.* *Trid. Seſs.* 7. *Can.* 8.

My Second Anſwer is, That the Doctrine above delivered, depends not on either of theſe two Opinions determinately, for admit which you pleaſe, yet it cannot be deny'd, but that the Sacraments, duely applyed, bring with them an exigence, and infallible determination, for the conferring Supernatural Graces, Imprinting the Character,

&c.

&c. by vertue of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution. Independant whereof, Pray what power is there in Nature to indue the Matter and Forme of Sacraments with ſuch vertue and exigence, which all the force of Nature can never pretend to, or challenge as due? So that an Omnipotent Power is here rigorouſly neceſſary, to inſtitute and determine the Matter and Forme of Sacraments, (which is all their Eſſence) and to communicate to them this high Prerogative, which ſurpaſſeth all the ſtrength of Nature, as well Angelical as Humane.

A Ninth Objection. In the Collation of Prieſthood, as well the Church as the Ordainer direct their intention to the whole Liturgy, thereby to confer the Order, not determining any one part more then another, and certainly the whole contains all the Eſſentials, and conſequently thereby the Order muſt be Validly conferr'd, there being nothing wanting, neither the Eſſentials, nor the intention of the Miniſter to the Validity thereof.

My

My Firſt Anſwer is, That though in ſome caſes a denomination may be appropriated to the whole, which cannot be applyed to the parts thereof, if taken ſeparately, as the compound of a body, and a reaſonable Soul, is a Man, and yet neither the Body nor the Soul, taken ſeparately, and by themſelves, is a Man. So likewiſe, a Number is made up of ſeveral Unities, and yet never an Unity by it ſelf is a Number. Yet when there is a real and Phyſical effect to be produced, and the parts of the whole are applyed ſucceſſively, ſo as that when one part is exiſtent, the other is paſt, and not then in being, and the ſubſequent parts are not yet extant. In this caſe a real effect cannot proceed from them all, neither by a Phyſical action, nor by a Phyſical determination: but this real effect muſt be produced in the ſame moment of time, when the cauſe of it is exiſtent, whether its influence be Phyſical, or Moral, provided that its determination to ſuch an effect be Phyſical. Now for application.

In

In the ſame moment of time that the Order of Prieſthood is conferr'd, there is a Spiritual Power given to the Ordained, there are ſeveral Real and Supernatural Graces produced, there is a Real Character Imprinted. Theſe are the effects. Now let us inquire into the Cauſe. The Eſſential Matter and Forme of Ordination, duely applyed, are the cauſe of thoſe real effects, either by a real influence, and principiating the action which produceth them, or by a real determination, or ſtrict exigence of having then actually produced, according to the Divine Decree of Inſtitution, ſo that the effect cannot be deferr'd, or ſuſpended, when the cauſe, either Phyſical or Moral is ſufficiently applyed. And certain it is, that the Ritual contains many circumſtantial, and accidental Rites, intermixt with the Eſſentials, and ſeveral parts of the Maſs, as they ſucceſſively occurre, for they are not all Eſſentials, neither is the Perſon to be Reordained if any one action of the whole Ritual be omitted. Whence it enſues, that ſome

one

one determinate Matter and Forme in particular, is the cauſe of the forementioned effects, and in that cauſe conſiſts the Eſſence of Ordination. And yet if we run over all the parts of the *Roman* Ritual, there is no Matter that can be Eſſential, except it be the Tradition of the Inſtruments, or the Impoſition of Hands; for nothing elſe was ever eſteemed, in the leaſt, as Eſſential. The Tradition of the Veſſels cannot be Eſſential, as we have clearly proved above in the Fifth *Section*; as for the Impoſition of Hands, we find it in three places only in the *Roman* Ritual, and neither of theſe three Impoſitions of Hands, belong to the Eſſential Matter of Ordination, as we have proved in the Fourth *Section*, by Induction, or enumeration of parts.

My Second Anſwer is, That notwithſtanding the drift of this Objection, which is to involve all in obſcurity and confuſion; yet, whether they will or no, their Eſſential Matter and Forme are fixt, from whence they cannot recede; for the Tradition of the

the Inſtruments, and the Forme that affects them, which they have introduced, can have no other end then to conſtitute the Eſſentials of Prieſthood. The Forme is this, *Receive a power of offering Sacrifice*, &c. Theſe words, if they have any ſignification, import a Power of offering Sacrifice then conferr'd upon the Ordained, and nothing elſe. And the offering of Sacrifice is the chief action of a Prieſt, becauſe it impowers him to Conſecrate the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*; which none but a Prieſt can do. *Actus Presbyterorum* (ſaith *Albertus Magnus*) *eſt Conſecrare corpus, & Sanguinem Chriſti; & eſt actus principalis. Alius eſt conſequens, ſcilicet ligare, & ſolvere. The Act of Prieſts is to Conſecrate the Body and Blood of Chriſt, and it is the principal Act. The other is conſequent, which is to Retain, and Abſolve: which they all grant, therefore they muſt acknowledge Prieſthood to be hereby conferr'd.* For, To what other ſenſe can they draw thoſe words, *Take, Receive, Accept the Power of offering Sacrifice?* and the Ordained comes with a full intention to Receive the Power; whence there cannot

Albert. Mag. L. 6. Theolog. veritatis. C. 36.

not be the leaſt ſhadow of any other deſign, then intending this Matter and Forme, as the Eſſentials of Prieſthood.

P SECT. VIII.

SECT. VIII.

An Illation drawn from the Premises, of the Invalidity of Ordination in the Church of England. *Solved.*

Trid. Sess. 23. Can. 3.

THe Council of *Trent* seems to make no difference between Order and Ordination, but confounds them together: *Si quis dixerit Ordinem sive Sacram Ordinationem, non esse verè & propriè sacramentum à Christo Domino institutum*, &c. *Anathema sit. If any one shall say, That Order, or Holy Ordination, is not truly and properly a Sacrament, Instituted by* Christ, *&c. let him be Accursed.* But I shall make it appear, that there is a considerable difference between Order, and Ordination; the one is that which they call a Sacrament, the other not. The Order of Priesthood is a Spiritual Power, whereby the Ordained is enabled, and Commissioned to exercise all Priestly Functions with Autority. The Ordination consists in the Essential Matter and Forme regularly and aptly

aptly applyed, by the Bishop, which is the Ordainer, to him that is Ordained; and from this Matter and Forme so applyed, results in the Ordained, that Spiritual Power, which is properly the Order of Priesthood, the Character is thereby Imprinted, and the Graces accommodated to the Priestly Ministry are also conferr'd. So that Order, with its concomitants, is the effect; but Ordination is the cause. That is permanent in the Ordained for terme of life; this is tranfient, and passeth away, for it lasts no longer then while that power is in conferring. That is the principal end intended by *Christ*. This is the means Instituted by *Christ* to attain that end. That is, as it were a Patent, or Commission, which the Priest acts by, this the cause, either efficient or Moral, which procured it: wherefore these being so different from each other, the Council of *Trent* could not intend to have them both Sacraments, but that alone (if any) must be a Sacrament, which confers the Order of Priesthood to the Ordained, and also Imprints the Character, *&c.* all this is performed by Ordination, not by Order; for nothing can be the cause of it self. Order is

the effect, and therefore cannot be the cauſe. The Character and Sacramental Graces are not produced by the Order, but by the Ordination, ſo that if any be a Sacrament it muſt be this, which being premiſed, as evident in it ſelf.

A Tenth Objection, by way of Deduction, is drawn from the precedent Doctrine: For if the Ordination of the Church of *Rome* be Invalid, it muſt of neceſſity draw with it, the Nullity of the Church of *Englands* Ordination, who received her Orders from the Church of *Rome*, and cannot make out her Succeſſion of Biſhops from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, without paſſing through the ſides of the *Roman* Biſhops, who muſt integrate the linkes of continuation; Wherefore, if the Church of *Rome* have no true Biſhops, it inevitably follows, that the Church of *England* muſt lye under the ſame Cenſure; for, one that hath no power of Order, can never confer that power upon another, becauſe none can give that which he hath not. Otherwiſe it would follow, that meerly Men, or Civil Magiſtrates, might confer Orders, which no Man will grant.

My

My Anſwer to this Objection, is grounded in a Principle, received by the *Romaniſts* themſelves, namely, that where the true Eſſentials are regularly, and orderly applyed, though there be a defect in the Ordainer for want of the power of Order, yet if he Ordains, *Cum titulo colorato, & bona fide*, the Ordination is valid.

Four things therefore are neceſſary to the Validity of Ordination conferr'd by ſuch a Biſhop.

Firſt, That none of the Eſſentials be wanting.

Secondly, That nothing be added in the Ordination repugnant to the Eſſentials, or deſtructive of their Operation.

Thirdly, That there be in the Ordainer *Titulus coloratus, & bona fides*; that is, a general preſumption, that he is a true Biſhop, and that he Ordains according to his Conſcience, knowing nothing amiſs.

Fourthly, That he have a right Intention of conferring the Order.

Where theſe Requiſites do concurre, the Ordination is certainly valid.

The Firſt Proof hereof is grounded upon that provident care that *Chriſt* ever had of his Church; for when all the Eſſentials and neceſſary Conditions are applyed, and no Moral defect to be imputed to the Ordainer, nor the Ordained, and no Humane prudence could ever detect that ſecret defect in the Ordainer; it would be too ſevere that the Original Inſtituter of Ordination, ſhould refuſe to the Ordained the power of Order, nay, in a ſhort time, it would prove deſtructive to the whole Church; for *Chriſt* knew full well, the fragility of Humane Nature, and conſidering his infinite Wiſdom, and Protection of his Church, would not oblige our imbecility to Moral Impoſſibilities; or if we failed by our Natural Weakneſs, without either ſin, or voluntary error, would permit the utter ruine and deſtruction of his Church;

Church; which would certainly inſue, if ſuch Ordinations were not valid. For I ſuppoſe the Ordainers and Ordained, to proceed with a candid, ſincere, and good Conſcience, and that Morally ſpeaking, have not the leaſt ſuſpicion of any default or want of power in the Ordainer; nay, he himſelf neither knows, nor ſurmiſeth any deficiency in his Order. In this Caſe, Should the Ordination be void, and null? Whom could we impute it to? certainly to none but thoſe, who by their Superinductions pretended to Correct *Chriſt*'s Inſtitutions, and thereby rendred all defective. But muſt this be ſo prejudicial to the Church of *Chriſt*, as to involve all Poſterity into the Imputation of the ſame Crime, who were no way conſenting to it? nay, who in due time reformed ſuch abuſes, and wholly diſclaimed from them? No certainly, our Great Redeemer is more equitable, and knows who rejects his Ordinances, and Inſtitutions, and who endeavors to maintain them.

But now, ſince Pride, Ambition, or a vain Pretence to an Arbitrary Power, againſt Divine Right, or what Motive

elſe, I know not, induced the Prelates of the Church of *Rome* to evacuate *Chriſt*'s Inſtitutions, and in their place to ſubſtitute their own, and hereby to make Ordination void; ſo likewiſe is Human frailty ſubject to many ſuch defects, whereof ſome are imputable of crime to the firſt Authors, but not to thoſe that ſucceed them, for I ſuppoſe theſe to be blinded by invincible ignorance; others proceed only from the weakneſs, and limited capacity of Human nature, without any deformity or Moral defect in their wills. Wherefore ſhould the Church of God ſo rely upon our weak capacities, that a ſecret and clandeſtine defect in an Ordainer, which no vigilance, nor Human precaution can avoid (when all other requiſites are applyed, and all have an invincible ignorance of that ſecret defect?) Should this, I ſay, render all his Ordinations invalid, when all other requiſites are applyed? then another ſuch defect, may, on the ſame account, incidently fall on another, conſidering our weakneſs, or Malice in the beginners; and ſo on a third, and at length no Biſhop, nor Prieſt, that's validly Ordained, will be found in the Church.

See

See how this is inductive to the Churches ruine, which certainly had been long-ſince deſtroyed, had not the Divine Inſtituter thereof maintained it by ſupplying ſuch defects (which we can neither avoid nor prevent) which he can as eaſily do, as he firſt Inſtituted the Sacraments, and Ordination; for it is he alone that gives the Spiritual Order to the Ordained, and to give it in theſe circumſtances is but congruous, for none concerned in ſuch an Ordination are blameworthy, and not to give it, is abſolutely, and (by common providence) inevitably deſtructive of the whole Church, which certainly the Supreme Lord thereof, will not deliver up to ruine, ſince with ſo much difficulty, care, and tenderneſs, he Inſtituted it, and to the ſame it belongs firſt to Inſtitute, and then to Conſerve.

But, this Doctrine ſeems to adminiſter the occaſion of a reply; for admitting that *Titulus coloratus*, *& bona fides*, do ſupply the defect of Order in the Ordainer; ſo that one who is by all eſteemed, and reputed a true Biſhop, yet in effect, by reaſon of ſome

ſecret

ſecret default, is not ſo, when all other requiſites, and eſſentials, are aptly and duely applyed, do validly Ordain: Why then cannot this Doctrine be applied to the *Roman* Biſhops? For if they ſhould be defective in the Power of Order, yet adhibiting all eſſentials, and other neceſſary conditions, their Ordinations would alſo be valid among themſelves; for we cannot in Charity preſume, that they proceed againſt their Conſcience, or that they want that ſincerity, and right intention which we ſuppoſe in others. This being ſuppoſed, the caſe is the ſame; for if the *Roman* Biſhops validly Ordained the Biſhops of the Church of *England*, Why ſhould not they validly Ordain their own?

I Anſwer, That they Ordain their own Prieſts and Biſhops according to the *Roman* Ritual, and conſequently they want the maine requiſite, which is the eſſential Matter and Forme, for they have Innovated a Matter and Forme of their own, far different from that which *Chriſt* Inſtituted, and they cleerly ſignifie by that Forme, that they intend thereby to confer the Order,

Order of Prieſthood, ſo that they cannot intend to Ordain by the Eſſential Matter and Forme derived from the Apoſtles (if any ſuch be contained in their Ritual) except they would be reputed deluders, as hath been proved at large in the Fifth, Sixth, and Seventh *Sections* of this *Diſputation*. Wherefore according to the diſpoſition of the *Roman* Ritual, the Eſſence of Ordination cannot ſubſiſt. And certainly nothing can have a being, without its own Eſſence, as all muſt grant. For the Church of *Rome* partly by adding their new reputed Eſſentials, to which their intention of Ordaining muſt be fixed, and partly by Inverting the Order, have made ſo great a confuſion, that one part deſtroys another, and particularly their Eſſentials, do abſolutely deſtroy the Eſſentials Inſtituted by *Chriſt* (if their Liturgy contain any ſuch) and hinder their effect.

But when the Biſhops, that were Ordained in the Church of *Rome*, had deſerted their Communion, and Ordained the Biſhops of the Church of *England*, they did it by the *Engliſh* Ritual, which contains the very Eſſential Matter and Forme Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, and delivered

to

to us by the *Apoſtles*, which were ſo duely and regularly applyed to the Ordained, as was ever in practiſe in the antient Church, ſo that here nothing at all was wanting, that in the caſe propoſed, was neceſſary to the validity of Ordination. Wherefore this Ordination is far different from that which the *Roman* Biſhops uſe, when they Ordain according to the *Roman* Paſtoral. And conſequently, the Ordination which the *Romans* uſe among themſelves is Invalid, but the Ordination of the *Engliſh* Biſhops reteins its Integrity.

A Second Proofe hereof is grounded upon the practiſe of the *Greek* Church, whoſe Ordination the Church of *Rome* ever approved as valid, yet they always uſed the Impoſition of hands, as the Eſſential matter of Prieſthood, with this Forme, *Divina Gratia, quæ ſemper infirma ſanat, & deficientia complet, promovet hunc Deo amabilem Diaconum in Presbyterum. The Divine Grace that always cures that which is infirme, and compleats that which is deficient, promotes this pious Deacon to Prieſthood.* Conſider here what precaution the *Greeks* uſed in the Eſſential

ſential Forme of their Ordination; for knowing, how prone we are all to errors, and miſtakes; they, in a matter of ſuch high concern, have recourſe to the Author of Grace, to confirm, and ſtrengthen that, which, by Human Frailty, might be weak and unſtable; as alſo to compleat the defects, and ſupply the wants of their Ordination, in caſe any thing elſe ſhould be neceſſary, not known to them; And hereby they uſed their beſt endeavors, to prevent the nullity of their Ordinations, which might proceed from their own weakneſs, or inadvertency, as not being ignorant, how many errors, and miſtakes we are ſubject to, notwithſtanding the beſt of our endeavors to the contrary. Which implyes a confidence in them, that uſing the true Eſſentials, and a right intention, *Chriſt* would ſupply all other ſecret defects; whereof the want of the power of Order in the Ordainer is one, eſpecially, when he is generally reputed by all, and by himſelf alſo, a true Biſhop. For as it is above obſerved, in the beginning of this *Section*, the Power of Order in the Ordained, is no Eſſential part of Ordination, but meerly the effect thereof, ſo that the

Ordination

Ordination is Essentially, and Specifically compleat without it; and becauſe Ordination is Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, as a means to determine him to confer this Spiritual Power upon the Ordained, How reaſonable and congruous is it, that the cauſe being compleat, the effect ſhould not be wanting? eſpecially ſince it exceeds our capacity to diſcover the defect. For when a cauſe is hinder'd from producing his effect, either by contrary agents, or by the indiſpoſition of the *Medium*, or by the incapacity of the *Paſſum*, we cannot thence infer, that the agent is incompleat, or wants vertue, *quantum eſt ex ſe*, for as much as belongs to it, to produce its effect. But in this caſe, the power of Order, is no Phyſical, but a *Moral* effect; and in all Ordinations it is given by *Chriſt* alone, *ad exigentiam Ordinationis*, by a determination, which proceeds from the Ordination, by vertue of Divine Inſtitution; for it is *Chriſt* alone that impowers the Ordained, validly to exerciſe the Functions of his Order, which is but a Moral Power, whoſe immediate cauſe is not the Ordainer, but only *Chriſt*, thereunto determin'd by the Ordinati-

on,

on which doth very much facilitate and confirm the foreſaid Doctrine.

A Third Proofe, is drawn from an acknowledged Principle of thoſe of *Rome*, who, after a vacancy, when a new Pope is choſen, the Cardinals in the Conclave only concur to make the Election Canonical, which being done, all the Power they have, cannot communicate to the new elected Pope, that Univerſal Juriſdiction over all the Church, which they pretend to, becauſe they have no ſuch Jurisdiction in themſelves, every Biſhop and Cardinal being confined within the limits of his own Dioceſs: and one Biſhop cannot extend his Juriſdiction to the Subjects of another Dioceſs. From whence then doth the Pope receive his pretended Univerſal Juriſdiction? Here they muſt of neceſſity have recourſe to the Supreame Lord of the Church, which is *Chriſt* himſelf, for the obtaining this Juriſdiction for their new Pope, which neither they, nor their Canonical Election can effect; for this Election is only a Condition, not the Cauſe of ſuch an illimited Juriſdiction, ſo that *Chriſt* alone is the only cauſe of this Pretended

tended Papal Juriſdiction. Why then in like caſe, when the Ordination is compleated *in foro externo*, and no error committed *in foro interno*? Why I ſay, in this caſe, ſhould not *Chriſt* in like manner confer to the Ordained the Spiritual Power of Order? for though the Ordination be never ſo Canonical and compleat, yet ſtill it is *Chriſt* alone that grants the power of Order, and it is he alone that gives Juriſdiction to every Biſhop in his Ordination; and even in the Church of *Rome*, the Juriſdiction of Biſhops comes not from the Pope, but from *Chriſt*; and therefore *Juriſdictio Epiſcopalis eſt Juris Divini*; *Epiſcopal Juriſdiction is of Divine Right*, *becauſe it proceeds immediately from Chriſt*. So that in any Ordination, when no eſſential nor neceſſary condition is wanting, though the Ordainer have not the power of Order, yet being univerſally reputed a true Biſhop, and this defect being ſecret, that Morally ſpeaking, no Human Induſtry can diſcover it, and all concencerned in the Ordination do proceed ſincerely, and with a good Conſcience; What true Chriſtian can frame ſo hard a judgment of our Great Redeemer,

deemer, as to deny to the Ordained the power of Order, and thereby permit ſo great a breach in his Church, which hath an immediate tendency to the utter ruine thereof, when it may be ſo eaſily remedied, and when neither the Ordainer, nor the Ordained, can, in the leaſt, have any imputation of blame?

As to the Point of Succeſſion mentioned in the Objection; I Anſwer, That this ſucceſſion is not to be underſtood in a Mathematical, but a Moral Senſe, and it is the ſame in Ordination, as it is in all other Dogmatical points, and Principles of Faith, contained under the Reformation. For though the *Latin* Church (which is but one Branch of the Univerſal Church) was Guilty of many Errors in matter of Faith, and for many years ſwerv'd from the Doctrine and Practiſe of *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, yet this could impoſe no neceſſity upon the Succeſſors of this Branch, ever to be excluded from the hopes of Salvation. For when the *Erroneous Principles* of the Church of

Rome were sufficiently detected, they might, yea they ought, to Reforme such abuses, and to conforme themselves to the Original Doctrine, and Practise of the Primitive Church, which were the immediate Successors to the *Apostles*, and so to redintegrate their Faith, and for the future, to regulate their Faith and Practise, by that never erring Rule of the Doctrine and Practise of *Christ* and his *Apostles*. And shall then the Church of *Rome* Object against them, that they cannot proye their Succession from *Christ* and the *Apostles*. Which in plain termes signifies no more then this, That they have not persisted in the Errors of the Church of *Rome*, but have imbraced a new Doctrine. New indeed to them, but exactly conformable to the old Doctrine, which *Christ* left to his Church, and which the Church of *Rome*, long since deserted, and so Interrupted the Continuation of Professing the True and Orthodox Principles of *Christ*, which we, by our Reformation, do Reassume, and chuse rather to follow *Christ* and his *Apostles*, then, to adhere to the False and Erroneous

Erroneous Principles of the Church of *Rome*; If this be a Crime, then we are Guilty. Muſt we lye under the Imputation of Blame, becauſe we would not run headlong, to utter Ruine and Damnation, by adhering to the Erroneous Doctrine of *Rome*? Muſt that one word of *Succeſſion* ſtartle us, and be inductive to perſwade us, to leave Heaven, and go with them to Hell for Company's ſake? They have made a long continued Breach in the Church themſelves, and interrupted their own Succeſſion, and, Muſt they blame us for returning to the Truth, becauſe we will not ſucceed them in their Errors? So then our Succeſſion in Dogmatical Points, in Practiſe and Ordination, conſiſts in this, that after a Breach made by the *Latin* Church, we having cleerly Detected the Error, have reunited our ſelves again, to the Antient and True Profeſſors of *Chriſtianity*, and deteſted the oppoſite and Erroneous Doctrine of thoſe that had Apoſtated from the True Church.

The laſt Clauſe contained in the cloſe of the Objection, that purſu-

ant to this Doctrine, a meer Secular Layman may confer Orders, is eaſily ſolved, becauſe this no way follows; for in this caſe, he could neither Ordain with a colourable Title, nor with a good Conſcience, which are both neceſſary for the validity of Ordination; he wants the firſt, becauſe he never was eſteemed to have the power of Order, and he himſelf knows certainly that he never was in Orders, nor ever attempted to receive them; ſo that in preſuming to Ordain, he commits a heinous Sacrilege, by a groſs contempt of the *Holy Ghoſt*; which is inconſiſtent with a candid, ſincere, and conſcientious proceeding, ſo that he wants the ſecond alſo, and beſides, in ſo doing, he can never have a right intention to confer Orders, becauſe he is conſcious, that he cannot have ſeveral requiſites, without which he cannot Ordain.

I only add this General Rule; That according to the preſent Conſtitution, and Inſtitution of *Chriſt*, practiſed by the Primitive Church, it is impoſſible to confer Prieſthood validly,

lidly, except the Impoſition of Hands be applyed as the Eſſential Matter, and accompanyed by the words of the Biſhop, ſignifying Prieſthood to be thereby conferr'd, as the Eſſential Forme, which the Church of *England* Religiouſly obſerveth in their Ordination; for while the Biſhop with other Prieſts, puts his Hands upon the Head of him that is to be Ordained, he pronounceth this Forme;

Receive the Holy Ghoſt, for the Office and Work of a Prieſt, in the Church of God, now committed unto thee, by the Impoſition of our Hands. Whoſe ſins thou doſt forgive, they are forgiven; and whoſe ſins thou doſt retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful diſpenſer of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments, in the Name of the Father, &c.

Here are both the Eſſentials duely applyed, and punctually obſerv'd. Whereas the Church of *Rome* ap-

plyes neither as an Eſſential part, and therefore their Ordination of Prieſts, according to their own Doctrine, can in no way be Valid.

SECT. IX.

SECT. IX.

Conſectaries drawn from the Proofes of the precedent Aſſertion.

HOw many falſe Aſpertions, and querulous Cavillations, have been raiſed by the *Jeſuits*, and other *Romaniſts*, againſt the Biſhops of the Church of *England*, under that frivolous pretence of their being Conſecrated at the *Naggs head* Tavern, in *Cheapſide*, by one ſingle Biſhop, or at moſt by two, and they not Canonically Elected, and Conſecrated, in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign. All which were falſe and Malitious Calumnies, invented for no other end, then to depreſs the Autority of the Biſhops of *England*, thereby to facilitate their acceſs, to draw Proſelites from the Church of *England*, and ſeduce them to their Communion. Which ſcandalous, and ungrounded Comments have been fully Anſwered, and

the Canonical Ordination, and Conſecration of the Biſhops of *England*, cleerly vindicated from the falſe Imputation of all ſuch Detracters, by that Worthy, and Learned Prelate *John Bramhall*, *D. D.* and late Lord Primate of *Ireland*.

But, What judgment ſhall we frame, of the Ordination of Biſhops, and Prieſts in the Church of *Rome?* there being at preſent neither *Pope*, nor *Cardinal*, nor *Biſhop*, nor *Prieſt*, but ſuch as have been Ordained according to their new Model of Ordination; we ſhall not need here to have recourſe to frivolous, and feigned Stories, where ſuch grounded Truths ſtrike at the very Eſſentials of their Ordination, and evince the invalidity thereof. Neither can they raiſe a Battery of Arguments againſt us, without deſtroying themſelves; for the Proofes of the nullity of their Ordination, are grounded on their own Doctrine. They all Teach, That Ordination is a Sacrament Inſtituted by *Chriſt*. The Council of *Trent* hath defined it ſo to be, as we ſee above, *Sect.* 7. They all aſſert the Matter and Forme of all Sacraments, to be

be determined, by Divine Autority, which *Suarez* ſaith is *de fide.* See their words, *Sect. 6.* They hold moreover, that any ſubſtantial change, either in Matter or Forme, renders the Sacrament invalid. *Si mutatio materiæ aut formæ Eſſentialis, ſeu ſubſtantialis ſit, nullum efficitur Sacramentum*, ſaith *Suarez*, which is the current opinion of their other Divines. It is likewiſe certain, that the matter which they uſe in the Collation of Prieſthood is eſſentially, and more then Specifically different, from the matter which *Chriſt* Inſtituted, and which was conſtantly uſed in Ordinations many Centuries after *Chriſt*, before Ordination was new molded. It is alſo certain, that the Forme of Ordination determined by *Chriſt*, and a long time in uſe in the Church, is now utterly rejected, and caſt out.

3 *Part. Tom.* 3. *D.* 2. *S.* 4.

All this being duely ponder'd, we muſt of neceſſity conclude, that their Ordination is invalid; except ſome other grounded expedient can be found out, and proved, to uphold the validity of their Ordination, which hitherto I cannot diſcover, but wiſh I could.

could. But no quibbles, nor quirkes, nor nice diſtinctions, can any way avail them; for the matter of Fact is uncontroleable, and the Doctrinal part is evidenced by their own Words, and Writings, which it is now too late to retract. It is time therefore for them, ſeriouſly to conſider what expedient may be found out, to reinvalidate their Ordination, and to qualifie themſelves ſo, as they may be in a capacity to prevent this grand inconvenience for the future; for this ſhakes the very foundation, and renders the whole Hierarchy of their Church ruinous. If there are no Prieſts, there can be no Biſhops, ſince Epiſcopacy is no new Order ſuperadded, but only a farther extenſion of the Order and Character of Prieſthood, as they teach; well then may the Biſhops exerciſe their *poteſtatem jurisdictionis*, but can no way exerciſe, nor communicate to others their *poteſtatem Ordinis*, for none can exerciſe nor confer upon another, a power which he neither formally, nor virtually, nor radically contains in himſelf *jure communi*; but their Juriſdiction they diſtinguiſh from the Order of Presbitery, ſince divers Biſhops

ſhops, and Cardinals in the Church of *Rome* are only Deacons, or Subdeacons, and yet their Juriſdiction is as ample, and hath as great an extenſion, as if they were Prieſts, who commonly make uſe of other Suffraganean Biſhops, to Officiate, Confirm, and confer Orders in their Dioceſs.

Hence it enſues, that thoſe putative Biſhops, which are preſumed to be Canonically indued with Presbytery and Epiſcopacy (yet in reality are not ſo) when they perſonally exerciſe the Functions of Epiſcopacy, their Confirmation is void, yea, their very Conſecration of Chriſme, and other Holy Oyles, is of no effect: but after Conſecration, they retain nothing but the Natural Elements of Oyle and Balſome, as they were before, and ſo are uncapable of rendring any Spiritual Emolument, to thoſe to whom they are applyed; their Impoſition of Hands, and Benedictions, are no way available to the Confirmed, no more than if they were performed by a Lay-perſon; for where the radical power of Order is wanting, none of theſe Spiritual and Supernatural effects can enſue.

And

And when they Officiate in Maſs, and attempt to Conſecrate the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, and having Conſecrated the Hoaſte, they kneel down to adore it, and then elevate it, and ſhew it to the People, that they alſo may adore it; both they themſelves, and many Thouſands of the People do daily commit, at leaſt a Material Idolatry, though it may be, that Invincible Ignorance may excuſe them from a Formal one: for they exhibit a worſhip of *Latria* to a ſuppoſed Deity, under the ſpecies of Bread, when, in reality, no ſuch Deity is there, ſo as they give to the meer ſubſtance of Bread, a Worſhip due to God alone. And this is daily repeated thorough the whole extent of the *Roman* Juriſdiction. And the ſame happens, when any other inferior Prieſt Officiates; for the Order of Prieſthood is equally defective in them all: and where there is no power of Order, to qualifie them for Conſecration, this muſt of neceſſity be void.

So when they adminiſter the Communion to the People, who preſent themſelves, in hopes to receive the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, and conſequently thoſe Graces, which from thence

thence accrew to the worthy Receivers; Poor Souls! How are they deluded, and their hopes fruſtrated? for, whereas they came full fraught with the expectation of Spiritual and Supernatural Graces, they are diſmiſt with a bare piece of Bread, and not the leaſt acceſs made to their inherent and ſanctifying, nor to their actual and tranſient Graces. Neither is it for once or twice, that they are ſo treated, but conſtantly, and *toties quoties*, which certainly is an unworthy abuſe, and a Spiritual Cheat, did not the Authors thereof proceed *bonâ fide*, as not having detected the Error.

Their Power of Relaxing and Retaining ſins, participates much of the nature of Epiſcopacy, in this reſpect, that neither the one nor the other is a diſtinct Order from Prieſthood, but both of them neceſſarily and eſſentially preſuppoſe Prieſthood already Confer'd, as the ground-work and foundation on which they depend; ſo that the Power of Abſolving, is a ſuperinduction to Prieſthood, or rather a conſequent faculty that iſſues from it; and if this Order be wanting, that power

power can never be validly conferr'd; wherefore the Penitents preſuming upon the validity of this Power, and their eaſie acceſs to Abſolution, hence take occaſion to be leſs circumſpect, and to let the reins looſe to ſuch ſins as their ſenſual appetite prompts them to; but when they come to make their Confeſſion, and receive Abſolution, though they have diſcover'd their Sore, and the nature of the Spiritual Diſtemper of their Souls, yet no Soveraign Medicine can be apply'd, in order to their Cure, for want of Ability in their Spiritual Phyſitian; for where the Radical Power is wanting, the Deſired Effect cannot be produced: ſo they return with the clogg of their ſins, as burthenſome to them as before they came.

And not to inſiſt upon any more particulars, I ſhall conclude with this General Maxime; that the Invalidity of all other Functions, peculiar to Prieſthood alone, is an inſeparable companion to the Invalidity of their Ordination.

But

But it may be pretended, that *Conſecration*, *Communion*, *Abſolution*, &c. may be validly performed by one that hath *titulum coloratum*, *& bonam fidem*, a colourable title, a good Conſcience, *&c.* though he ſhould want the power of Order; according to the rule above given, in the *Eighth Section.*

Firſt, I Anſwer, That it is not likely, nor probable, that the Incarnate Word, would imploy his Omnipotency, to grant ſuch extraordinary favors to the Church of *Rome*, becauſe he can have no valuable motive to do it. For, Why ſhould *Chriſt* beſtow ſuch ſingular Graces on his Enemies? who have deſerted his Doctrine, changed his Ordinances and Inſtitutions, rob'd him (as much as in them lyeth) of his Prerogatives, and uſurp'd to themſelves a Power, which is peculiar to himſelf alone; and theſe favors to be conſtantly conferr'd upon them, and to be continued without intermiſſion, till the World's end, for there is little hope of

of their Retractation. And I dare aver, that if any indifferent judgment, ſhould ſeriouſly ponder their manifold Errors, whereof ſome are propoſed and proved in this *Treatiſe* (which I am ready to maintain againſt any legal oppoſition) it would plainly appear, that the Church of *Rome* is but a corrupted branch of the Univerſal Church of *Chriſt*, and conſequently ſequeſter'd from the True Church. And though I cannot deny, but that our benign Lord, grants to all (out of the Treaſure of his Merits) Grace ſufficient for their Salvation; yet, I fear, they will ſcarce render this Grace efficacious, by their cooperation with it; for it muſt be an extraordinary, a potent Grace, that muſt incline them to a Recantation.

Secondly, I Anſwer, that this Caſe propoſed in the Objection, is far different, from the Rule given above in the *Eighth Section*; for there the Queſtion was, of the preſervation, or utter ruine of a True Church of *Chriſt*, which cannot ſubſiſt without true

true Ordination; but here the caſe only concerns particular perſons, and they likewiſe, by the pravity of their own wills, long ſince, cut off from the True Church of *Chriſt*; neither would theſe favors (if granted) revive their Church, ſo as to render its Doctrine Orthodox, or any way to reduce the Members, or Heads thereof to a better ſenſe.

Wherefore, in this Caſe, there is no ground, nor motive to induce *Chriſt* to grant ſuch an extraordinary concurſe; but in the former caſe it was ſtrictly neceſſary for the preſervation of a conſiderable part of the True Church of *Chriſt*.

Beſides, in the Caſe here propoſed, our Omnipotent Redeemer muſt have recourſe to his Illimited Power, daily to make ſo many Thouſands of Miracles, and this conſtantly to be continued without interruption; but in the former caſe, we only Aſſert, that upon juſt and congruous grounds, our Gratious Redeemer, only for once, ſupplyed the defect of Order,

when no Eſſential, nor Neceſſary condition, or Requiſite was wanting.

SECT. X.

SECT. X.

Of Clandeſtine Marriage.

THE Church of *Rome*, that *Sancta mater Eccleſia*, pretends to ſo much Power and Autority, in ordering and diſpoſing of all things belonging to Sacraments, that it not only preſcribes the Manner and Method of their Adminiſtration, but alſo penetrates into the very Eſſence, and Subſtance of them, Subtracting, Adding, and Changing what ſhe pleaſeth; and indeed, in five of them, there might be ſome ſeeming pretence for it, they having received the honor of being called Sacraments, from that Churches Inſtitution, without ſufficient ground in Scripture for it; whereof this of Matrimony is one; of which we ſhall here Treate.

Marriage is a Contract between Man and Woman, containing a Mutual Tradition to each other, by proper words, *de preſenti*: the laſt words *de preſenti*,

diſtinguiſh Marriage from *Sponſalia*, or Betrothing, which is no Marriage, nor Actual Tradition: but a Promiſe of Marriage for the future. The Council of *Trent* hath defin'd Matrimony to be a Sacrament, and Anathematiz'd thoſe that ſhall deny it. *Si quis dixerit Matrimonium, non eſſe propriè & verè unum ex ſeptem legis Evangelicæ Sacramentis, à Chriſto Domino Inſtitutum; ſed ab hominibus in Eccleſiam invectum; neque gratiam conferre; Anathema ſit.*

Trid. Seſs. 24. Can. 1.

By the Conſtitutions of the Church of *Rome*, there are ſeveral Impediments of Marriage, which are diſtinguiſht into two Claſſis. The Firſt are ſuch as render Matrimony Invalid, which they call *impedimenta dirimentia*; They of the Second Claſſis are only *impedientia*, which render the perſons *inhabiles*, to Contract lawfully, yet having Contracted, the Marriage is valid. To Contract clandeſtinely, without ſuch Witneſſes as can give ſufficient proofe and evidence of the Contract, *in foro externo*, hath been alwayes prohibited, and therefore held unlawful, but yet valid; though now, ſince the Council of *Trent*, it is rendred

dred invalid. The words of the Council are theſe, *Qui aliter quam præſenti Parocho vel alio Sacerdote de ipſius Parochi, ſeu Ordinarii licentia, & duobus, vel tribus teſtibus, Matrimonium contrahere attentabunt; eos Sancta Synodus ad ſic contrahendum omnino inhabiles reddit; & hujuſmodi contractus irritos & nullos eſſe decernit; prout eos præſenti decreto irritos facit & annullat.* By which Decree, Clandeſtine Marriage which was before valid, though unlawful, is now made void, and of no effect. *Trid Seſs. 24. C. 1. Reforan. Matrim.*

Were Matrimony only a Civil Contract, and not defin'd by the Church of *Rome* to be elevated to the dignity of a Sacrament, and to produce Grace, here would be little ground of altercation; for it is not my intent, in this Diſcourſe, to call in queſtion the power of Eccleſiaſtical, or Secular Law-givers, in matters of this nature. But they acknowledge Marriage to be a Sacrament; and the Matter and Forme thereof (wherein conſiſts the whole Eſſence of it) to be inſtituted, and determin'd by Divine Autority, whence it becomes *Juris Divini*. Hence ariſeth the difficulty, How the Church

of *Rome* can make any alteration or change; or how they can declare, that to be ineffectual, and void, which *Jure Divino*, is determinately ſetled, and eſtabliſht as valid.

Clandeſtine Marriage, before the Council of *Trent*, was ever held an Eſſential and a valid Matrimony, though unlawful, *factum valet, ſed fieri non licet:* yea, and notwithſtanding the Councils Decree, they ſtill hold it valid in *England*, and *Saxony*, where the Council of *Trent* was never received, nor promulged; for they Teach, That no Human Law can induce an Obligation to the obſervance of it, but in ſuch places where it hath been ſufficiently intimated, and accepted. Here I ſuppoſe with them, that the whole Eſſence and Subſtance of each Sacrament, conſiſts purely in the two Eſſential parts, the Matter, and the Forme. The Matter of this Contract is the Internal Conſent of the Perſons Contracting, expreſt by ſome External and ſenſible ſign: The Forme is the words, *de præſenti*; *I take thee*, &c. which ſignifie a Mutual Tradition of themſelves to each other, for term of life. Hence I Argue againſt them,

them, *ad hominem*, ſuppoſing the Inſtitution as the Origine and Cauſe of all Sacraments.

The whole Eſſence of Matrimony neceſſarily Conſtitutes a valid Marriage; but the Matter and Forme are the whole Eſſence of Matrimony; *ergo*, the Matter and Forme neceſſarily conſtitute a valid Marriage. The Major is univerſally true in all things; for the whole Eſſence of a thing, and the thing it ſelf are convertible: the Minor is their own Doctrine, as appears by their own words above cited. Whence I ſubſume, The Matter and Forme neceſſarily conſtitute a valid Marriage; but Clandeſtine Matrimony contains the Matter and Forme, *ergo*, Clandeſtine Matrimony contains a valid Marriage. The Major is the concluſion of the laſt ſillogiſme. The Minor I prove *Firſt*; becauſe Clandeſtine Matrimony was valid before the Council of *Trent*, and yet it contains now the ſame Matter and Forme it did then. *Secondly*, I prove it, becauſe Clandeſtine Marriage is ſtill valid where the Council of *Trent* was never received, *ergo*, it hath the whole Mat-

ter and Forme of Marriage, which was Inſtituted, and determin'd by *Chriſt*, as the whole Eſſence of it: for they that Contract *Clandeſtinè*, have the ſame Internal conſent made ſenſible, which is the Matter; and uſe the ſame words by way of Forme, as they that Contract *in facie Eccleſiæ*; wherefore if the one hath the ſame Matter and Forme with the other (wherein conſiſts the whole Eſſence of Marriage) if the one be valid, the other muſt be valid alſo.

And this Argument proceeds in like manner againſt all other *impedimenta dirimentia*, ſuch impediments, as *Jure Eccleſiaſtico*, are introduced to render Matrimony void, and of no effect: but if there be any impediment *jure naturæ*, deſtructive of the validity of Matrimony, In this caſe it is moſt like, that the Original Inſtituter excepted it. As many of the *Roman* Divines conceive Conſanguinity in the Firſt Degree, to invalidate Matrimony, *jure naturæ*, by reaſon of the horror and averſion that Nature hath againſt a Fathers Marrying his own Daughter, or a Mothers taking her own Son for a Husband, or for

for a Brother to Marry his own Siſter. And therefore Marriage, in the firſt degree of Conſanguinity, was ever held invalid, in the Evangelical Law.

But this adminiſters matter for an inſtance againſt what hath been ſaid: for Marriage contracted in the firſt degree, hath all the Eſſentials of Matrimony, and only the proximity of Blood hinders the validity of it, therefore it is not enough to have all the Eſſentials, as Matter and Forme, to make Matrimony valid. I Anſwer, that all Sacraments do neceſſarily ſuppoſe the Original Inſtitution, upon which they Eſſentially depend; for the Eſſential parts of all Sacraments are in themſelves natural things, but by the Omnipotent Power of the Divine Inſtituter, the Complex which reſults of theſe parts is elevated *per potentiam obedientialem*, to produce Grace in the Receiver; in that quality and degree, as *Chriſt* hath ſetled and eſtabliſht, without which they are no Sacraments. And who can deny but that it was in the free power and election of the Divine Inſtituter, to affix his Supernatural Graces, where,

and

and when, and to what Inſtruments he pleaſed, for Sacraments are, by Inſtitution, but inſtruments to convey the Graces Merited by *Chriſt*, to our Souls; wherefore, it being incongruous, that a Contract made in the firſt degree of Conſanguinity, from which Nature hath ſo great a horror, ſhould be an inſtrument of conveying Grace to the Souls of the contracters; grounded Reaſon dictates, that this was excepted, and never Inſtituted for a Sacrament, which the conſtant practice of the Church from *Chriſt*'s time ſufficiently confirms.

But it may be reply'd, That if *Chriſt*, in the Original Inſtitution, Ordained, that all complexes reſulting from ſuch a determinate Matter and Forme, ſhould be Sacraments, and yet an exception may be made in one caſe, Why not in another? I Anſwer, That this Reply is grounded on a falſe Principle, for it ſuppoſeth *Chriſt* to have confuſed acts, ſuch as are proper to Men, when they determine things in general, and make an univerſal without diſtinguiſhing, or diſtinctly knowing

ing the particulars contained under that univerſal, which argues the imperfection of Human underſtanding, and therefore ſuch obſcure and imperfect acts have no place in *Chriſt*; for the underſtanding of the Divine Word is infinite, and conſequently exempt from the leaſt imperfection.

And the underſtanding of his Sacred Humanity was indued with an infuſed knowledge, whereby he ſaw, and knew clearly, and diſtinctly, all that concerned, at leaſt himſelf, as Redeemer of Mankind: ſo that when he Inſtituted the Sacraments, he did it not by a general notion, but reflected upon every particular individual, cleerly, and diſtinctly.

Wherefore, in the Caſe propoſed, he Ordained ſuch, and ſuch particular Contracts to be inſtruments of conveying Grace, and no others; ſo as thoſe only which *Chriſt* hath ſo determin'd, are valid Contracts, by Divine Inſtitution, and no others; and, by this

this means, the cleerneſs and perſpicuity of *Chriſt*'s underſtanding, hath particularly determin'd every individual Contract of Marriage, that ever hath been, or ever will be, and decreed its validity, or non validity in his Original Inſtitution, ſo as all Declarations and Decrees, as are meerly Human, have no power at all to alter, or change any thing, or to make this valid, and that invalid: theſe things being already immutably determin'd by *Chriſt* himſelf in his Original Inſtitution, which conſequently is *Juris Divini.*

Note, that though there be no warrant in Holy Writ, to conclude Matrimony a Sacrament; yet, becauſe I Diſpute *ad hominem*, I have hitherto ſuppoſed it to be a Sacrament, and ſhall ſo do for the future, the better to detect their Error, and the inconſequence of their Principles, for the Church of *Rome* will needs have it a Sacrament, producing Grace, and hath defin'd it ſo to be; and *argumentandi*

mentandi gratiâ, I ſuppoſe it ſo with them.

And ſo I proceed to Anſwer their Arguments for the Nullity of *Clandeſtine Marriage*.

SECT. XI.

SECT. XI.

The Arguments to vindicate the Nullity of Clandeſtine Marriage, *Anſwered.*

THE Firſt, and Principal Objection, is, That though the Church of *Rome* pretends no Right, directly to alter or change any thing appointed by *Chriſt*, yet it may have an indirect power, by ſubtracting the validity of that contract which is the groundwork and foundation of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution; for none but a civil contract was elevated by *Chriſt* to be a Sacrament; ſo that the validity of the contract, and the mutual obligation which it induced, was preſuppoſed to Divine Inſtitution; and ſuch a contract *Chriſt* elevated to the dignity of a Sacrament, and enabled it to produce Grace. Wherefore the Church of *Rome* having ample power to declare that, and other ſuch contracts, to be valid, or invalid, The Council of *Trent*, in

in perſuance to this power, hath declar'd Clandeſtine Marriage to be no Civil Contract, by taking away the mutual obligation, and conſequently the validity of it. And in all this the Council never toucheth the Ordination of the Primitive Inſtituter, but preciſely alters the contract, which is only, *Juris Humani*, and therefore intrencheth not in the leaſt upon Divine Inſtitution. This is the full ſtrength of this Objection.

The Firſt Anſwer, This is a ſubtil and a plauſible ſpeculation, to vindicate their treſpaſſing upon Divine Right, by pretending nothing but an indirect Power, whereby they wholly evacuate *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, as much as if they had a direct power to do it. 'Tis not unlike the indirect power which his Holineſs pretends to have, over the Territories and Dominions of Kings, and Secular Princes. For it cannot be deny'd (as they pretend) but that he hath a direct power to exerciſe his Juriſdiction, to ſuppreſs hereſie, and propagate his Church, therefore he muſt neceſſarily have a power, to uſe ſuch means as are requiſite to this

this end, and to remove all obſtacles, that may impede the attaining of it. Now ſuppoſe that a King, or Secular Prince, connives at Hereticks, and permits Hereſie within his Dominions; the Legate firſt admoniſheth him of the danger of it, but in vain; then he informes his Maſter, the Pope, whereupon a gentle Brief comes to the Prince, from his Holineſs, minding him of his duty, and endeavoring to ſtir up his zeale to promote the Holy Church, and ſuppreſs its enemies. If this will not do; then comes a Comminatory and Menacing Briefe, capable to ſeize him with a Pannick Fear, and dread of what will enſue. If no effect follows, then an Excommunication is thundered out againſt him, reſerved to the Pope himſelf, and, it may be, is backt by an Interdict. Then the Legate or Nuncius again exhorts him to withdraw himſelf out of that deplorable condition, and pretends Power from the Pope to abſolve him from thoſe execrable Cenſures, notwithſtanding the reſervation, and to withdraw the Interdict, if he will at laſt acquieſce, and comply with his Holineſs reaſonable intentions. And if he will not yet yield,

but

but perſeveres in his firſt reſolution, then the Legate is called home, and then follows Depoſition; he is deveſted of his Right to the Kingdom, his Subjects are Abſolved from their Allegiance to him, and he declared Criminal, *Læſæ Majeſtatis Divinæ*, ſo that to Aſſaſſinate him in this State, ſhould not be deem'd a Crime. And yet all this argues but an indirect Power on the Temporal Eſtates of Secular Princes.

So it is in our preſent caſe, they pretend only an indirect power to change the nature of the Contract, and whereas it was before mutually obligatory, they declare, that this obligation ceaſeth, and that for the future it ſhall not be held a Civil Contract, without any reflection made upon the Sacramental Inſtitution, and yet the Council, without any diſtinction, renders all perſons uncapable of contracting Clandeſtinely, and declares all ſuch Contracts to be void: *Prout eos præſenti decreto, irritos facit, & annullat*, which, in effect, deveſts them of their Sacramental Vertue, to which they were, by the Original Inſtitution,

deputed, and by this means deſtroys both Contract and Sacrament, and hinders its production of Grace, which argues a Supreme Power, to annihilate a Sacrament at pleaſure, under pretence of an indirect power, and therefore,

Secondly, I Anſwer, That this power which they pretend to, is nothing but a groundleſs uſurpation, which I prove evidently: for the original Inſtituter of Marriage, did not ordain it, by a general and confus'd notion, leaving the determination of particulars to the Church, to declare ſome to be void, and others to be valid, as they ſhould deem expedient. But he foreſaw plainly, and diſtinctly, every particular individual, and numerical contract, that in proceſs of time ſhould be made, between ſuch particular and individual perſons, with the particular circumſtances of time and place, *&c.* and theſe very particular Contracts he Inſtituted for Sacraments, and impower'd them to produce Grace, not conditionally, but abſolutely, without having a regard to what the Council of *Trent* ſhould do, ſo as that they did not hang

in

in ſuſpenſe, to expect till the Council of *Trent* ſhould approve or diſapprove of them; for ſuch an imperfect Inſtitution, were unworthy of *Chriſt*'s Infinite Perfections, and would make his will ſubordinate to the will of the Council, and his Inſtitution would be ſubſervient to the Councils determination, for by this means *Chriſt* would ſtand obliged to give, or refuſe his Sacramental Graces, where, and when, and to whom the Council ſhould determine him: which in effect is no other then to make the Omnipotent ſubject, and obedient to the Council of meer Men, liable to Ignorance and Error.

Now ſuppoſing *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution to be of this nature (which none in his right wits can deny) here is an abſolute and irrevocable decree, eſtabliſh'd by Divine Autority, that every particular contract, ſo Inſtituted, ſhall be elevated to a Sacrament, and produce Grace, which no ſubſequent Council can alter, or fruſtrate *Chriſt*'s Decree: and that for Two Reaſons;

Firſt, For want of Power.

Secondly, For want of due Order.

The Power is wanting, becauſe all Human power is finite and limited, and therefore cannot be in competition with the power of the Omnipotent; due Order is alſo wanting, becauſe *Chriſt*'s Decree was firmly ſetled, and eſtabliſh'd above Sixteen hundred years ſince; ſo this modern Decree of the Council comes too late to make any change or alteration in it, or any way to repeal or abrogate it. So they may talke of an indirect power of degrading the contract, and depriving it of its wonted obligation, and making it no civil contract, but all in vain, for *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution muſt ſtand.

Yet it may be Reply'd, That thoſe clandeſtine contracts, which were to be after the Decree of the Council, are no civil contracts, and therefore not comprehended under the number of thoſe that *Chriſt* Inſtituted as Sacraments.

I Anſwer, That the Supreame Legiſlator, in the Inſtitution of Sacraments, did not regulate himſelf by any ſubſequent and human Law made in prejudice of his Inſtitution, but well knowing thoſe Clandeſtine Contracts to be of their own nature obligatory, he confirm'd that mutual obligation in them, by erecting them to the dignity of Sacraments; which no human Decree can change; for otherwiſe the Councils might preſcribe him what Rules they pleaſed, to regulate his proceeding.

The Second Objection: Since we are deſtitute of any certain knowledge what thoſe Contracts were, that *Chriſt* Inſtituted as Sacraments, we ought, in this, to take the teſtimony of the Church, for the Rule of our Belief; who, by reaſon of her Infallibility, is beſt able to informe us, and ſecure us from Error: Wherefore, ſince the Church declares all ſucceeding Clandeſtine Contracts, to be no Sacraments, nor Civil Contracts, we have no reaſon, by our own fallible diſcourſe, to call in queſtion the verity of the Churche's Declaration.

I Anſwer, That the Church of *Rome*, not only declares thoſe ſubſequent contracts to be void, but, as much as in her lies, makes them ſo. *Prout eos preſenti decreto irritos facit, & annullat*; which, notwithſtanding, before this Decree were valid, and obligatory. As for the Church of *Romes* Infallibility, we have in the precedent Diſputation, examin'd it, and found it defective, and ſhall hereafter prove it erroneous; and therefore have no grounds to confide in it. But, in this caſe, we have made it appear, that the determination of thoſe Contracts, which, of their own nature, were Obligatory, was made, by Divine Inſtitution, and that ſuch Contracts were deputed to be Sacraments, long before this Decree of the Council; yea, and are ſtill reputed Sacraments, inducing a mutual obligation, here in *England*, and other places, where the Council of *Trent* was never received, which the Church of *Rome* acknowledges: How then could this ſubſequent Decree of the Council, have any influence upon thoſe contracts, which were eſtabliſht as valid, and indued

dued with a Sacramental vertue, by a Divine Decree, that was precedent to this human Decree of the Council? This being but a fruitleſs attempt, to render that invalid, which was conſtituted as valid, *Jure Divino*.

The Third Objection: Clandeſtine Marriage was ever held unlawful; and therefore they who contract ſo, commit a ſin in doing it, becauſe they tranſgreſs againſt a precept of their lawful Superiors; and it is not likely that *Chriſt* would affix his Supernatural Graces to a ſinful action; nay, it is impoſſible, that a Mortal ſin, and Grace, can ſtand together in the ſame ſubject. And therefore the Church might prudently preſume, that ſuch ſinful contracts were not Inſtituted by *Chriſt* as Sacraments.

Firſt, I Anſwer, That the *Romaniſts* themſelves muſt ſolve this Objection; for, they all grant, that clandeſtine Marriages were Sacraments, and valid contracts, ever before the Council of *Trent*, and are ſo ſtill in *England*, and *Saxony*; and yet they ever were, and ſtill are unlawful; which

circumſtance they muſt reconcile with *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution; for notwithſtanding the ſin, they acknowledge them to have been Inſtituted by *Chriſt* as Sacraments.

But *Secondly*, I Anſwer, That the circumſtance of contracting clandeſtinely, is wholly extrinſecal to the contract, and therefore can never alter the nature, nor eſſence of it, for circumſtances make no change in the ſubſtance; and this is common to all Sacraments; for whoever receives any Sacrament, may, out of the pravity of his own will, add ſome unlawful circumſtance to it, or receive it when his Soul is contaminated with ſin; but we muſt not hence conclude, that this deordinate proceeding of the Receiver, layes any infection upon the Sacrament, whoſe compleat ſubſtance and eſſence is wholly independant of the circumſtances, which are extrinſecal to it. True it is, that all Sacraments produce Grace, as alſo, that Grace and deadly ſin are wholly inconſiſtent, and therefore, whoſoever receives a Sacrament when he is actually in ſin, puts an Obſtacle to the effect of the Sacrament,

ment, and cannot then receive any Grace by it; becauſe ſin makes him liable to the pains of Hell; and Grace gives him, whoſe Soul it informs, a right to Glory; and becauſe theſe two are incompatible, therefore Grace, and Sin, that are the neceſſary cauſes of them, mutually exclude each other from the ſame Soul. Yet they generally Teach in the Church of *Rome*, That when the obſtacle is removed, and the Soul purged from ſin, that then the Sacrament revives, and produceth that Grace, which by the original Inſtitution was annexed to it; and this Doctrine they alſo apply to Moral actions, in reference to Inherent and Sanctifying Grace, which they Merit; for when one falleth into ſin, he loſeth all that habitual Grace which he poſſeſt before his fall, it being inconſiſtent with ſin; but when he is again reſtored to the ſtate of Grace, then his Merits revive to render him the ſame quantity of Sanctifying Grace, which he before had loſt by ſin. So is it in thoſe that contract clandeſtine Marriage, if invincible ignorance doth not excuſe them; they ſin, and receive no Inherent and Sanctifying Grace, till ſin, which is the obſtacle be removed; and,

in

in the ſame moment that this is done, the Sacrament revives, and produceth in their Souls its due proportion of habitual, and inherent Grace. See *Suarez Opuſcul.* 5. *D.* 2. *S.* 2. & 3.

And thus have I vindicated the Validity of *Clandeſtine Marriage* againſt the Church of *Rome*, by the Principles of their own Doctors; and conſequently, that Decree of the Council of *Trent*, is but a vain attempt, to render that void, which, by Divine Autority, is eſtabliſht as valid; which proceeding is originally drawn from a preſumption of their pretended Infallibility; And therefore whatſoever they decree, though againſt Divine Right, is held as Sacred, and not liable to error, as in this caſe it happens.

But this is certain, that theſe private Matrimonial Contracts were by *Chriſt* appointed as Sacraments, or they were not; if not, then the Church of *Rome* erred by ever acknowledging them as ſuch; if they were, then the Council of *Trent* errs, by endeavoring to repeal them

You'l ſay, That thoſe Contracts that preceded the Council, were Inſtituted by *Chriſt*, becauſe they were civil contracts, but they which ſucceeded were not, becauſe

becauſe they were no Civil contracts. Yes, becauſe the Council will have it ſo. But, Who ſees not, that according to this Doctrine, it is the Council, and not *Chriſt*, that is the proper Inſtituter of this Sacrament? for the Council determines what contracts ſhall be Sacraments, and what ſhall not; the Council determines to what contracts Grace ſhall be affixt, and to what not, which is all that Inſtitution imports, for they would have *Chriſt* to take his meaſures from them, and would impoſe a Law upon the Will of God, to accommodate himſelf to their will; they order all, and the Word Incarnate muſt regulate himſelf accordingly, which makes them the principal Inſtituters, and *Chriſt* only the Inſtrumental. Which is too great an indignity, and detracts very much from the perfection of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution. For I demand, What reaſon can be alleag'd, Why *Chriſt* could not, or would not determine all this himſelf? He had a perfect comprehenſion of all that concern'd his Church, which the Council had not; neither can they deny, but that *Chriſt* was the Principal, nay the only Inſtituter of Sacraments. Who

Who then can deny, but that *Chriſt*, by an Irrevocable Decree, determin'd all things relating to the Sacraments, independant of the Council of *Trent*, many Ages before this Inſtituting Decree was framed? But, an Error once committed, *per fas & nefas*, muſt be maintained.

I might here annex an Account of the proceedings of the Church of *Rome* in ſome others of their pretended Sacraments; for whereas the Order of Subdeaconſhip was ever conferr'd in the Primitive Church, by the Impoſition of Hands, this is now wholly omitted; and in lieu thereof they have Inſtituted the Tradition of an empty Chalice, and an empty Pattene to the Ordained, which argues a total change: So likewiſe in Confirmation, the *Apoſtles* and their Succeſſors ever Confirmed by the Impoſition of Hands, without any Unction; but now without the application of Chriſme, they deem Confirmation invalid, and the Forme would be falſe, which is this, *Signo te ſigno crucis, & Confirmo te Chriſmate ſalutis. In nomine*, &c. *I ſign thee with the*

the Sign of the Croſs, and Confirm thee with the Chriſme of health; In the Name, &c. But this I leave to others conſideration, for enough hath been already ſaid to my deſigned end.

Diſputatio III.

Diſpute III.

Of Communion in One Kind.

The Preface.

ALL Humane Laws, though never ſo well Conſtituted, are liable to be ſubverted, either by the change of circumſtances, or by the capricious humors of Governors. How happy were the Lacedemonians, *as long as they were govern'd by thoſe wholſome Laws which* Lycurgus *had eſtabliſhed amongſt them? but when thoſe Laws were gradually repealed, or* per non uſum, *antiquated, then their Commonwealth began to be ruinous, and tended to deſtruction. But Divine Laws ought to be Sacred, as being framed by an irrefragable Autority, whoſe Legiſlator is omniſcient; neither hath his wiſdom and prudence any bounds, who knows, and foreſees, all future changes*

changes and circumſtances, as perfectly, as if they were preſent, and whoſe infinite providence is beſt skilled in fencing againſt all adverſe accidents that may happen; and yet theſe Laws alſo muſt undergo the Teſt of Human Policy, and ſuffer change and Reformation: Our Great Redeemer furniſhed his Church with ſuch Laws as he thought moſt convenient, obliging all Chriſtians to receive thoſe Sacred Rites of his Body and Blood in both Kinds, yet, in proceſs of time, the Church of Rome, *upon ſome pretended inconveniences, hath alter'd that Law, and denyes the Laytie the uſe of the Chalice; but whether groundedly or illegally, is the drift of this Diſputation to Examine.*

SECT. I.

SECT. I.

The Grounds of the Church of Rome *for denying the* Chalice *to the Laity.*

THat Pure and Soveraign Doctrine, which was Taught and Practiſed by *Chriſt* himſelf, attained its Original Purity for the ſpace of many Centuries after *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*; during which time, the Sacrament of the Euchariſt was Adminiſtred to the faithful Receivers, under both Kinds; but the continuance of it, drew it inſenſibly more remote from its Origine, and ſo expoſed it to the danger of being Adulterated; for the *Romaniſts* pretend, that it was obſerved, that when the Communicants lips were ſeparated from the Chalice, ſome ſmall particles of the Conſecrated Species, fell from the Chalice, which it was not poſſible to prevent, or to collect the Particles ſo diſperſed; wherefore another expedient

pedient was instituted, that they who presented themselves to participate of those Sacred Mysteries, should suck the Consecrated Species out of the Chalice by a Silver Quil, fitly adapted, and prepared for that purpose: yet all in vain, for this also was found liable to the same inconvenience; wherefore finding no remedy, for so great a difficulty, it was at last resolved, That none of the Seculars, nor the Clergy, except such as were Priests, should receive the Blood, under the Species of Wine. So the Council of *Trent*, *Quæ agnoscens Sancta mater Ecclesia, hanc suam in Administratione Sacramentorum Auctoritatem, licet ab initio Christianæ Religionis, non infrequens utriusque speciei usus fuisset; tamen progressu temporis, latissimè jam mutata illa consuetudine; gravibus, & justis causis adducta, hanc consuetudinem, sub altera specie communicandi approbavit, & pro lege habendam decrevit; quam reprobare, aut sine ipsius Ecclesiæ Auctoritate, pro libito mutare, non licet.* *Trid. Sess. 21. C. 2.*

And then layes a Curse upon those that should not submit to this Doctrine, in these words, *Si quis dixerit Sanctam*

Ecclesiam Catholicam, non justis causis, & rationibus adductam fuisse, ut Laicos, atque etiam Clericos non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse, Anathema sit.

Sess. 22. *Can.* 2.

The First Reason: Because it was a great irreverence, and a high Contempt of the Sacred Blood of *Christ*, which was the price of our Redemption, to see it fall to the ground, and trampled under foot, by those who receive so great a benefit by it, and whereunto they stand indebted, for the Graces they receive here, and the hope of Glory hereafter; wherefore the high Veneration and Adoration which we owe to the Incarnate Word, present in this Sacrament, ought to preponderate all other Considerations, which certainly our Redeemer expects from us.

The Second Reason: Because whosoever receives the Holy Eucharist, under the Species of Bread only, receives all *Christ*, as well the Blood as the Body, together with the Divine Word, and all the Sacred Trinity: for though

though *ex vi verborum*, by the words of Conſecration, only the Body of *Chriſt* be Sacramentally Conſtituted under the Species of Bread; yet, *per concomitantiam*, by a neceſſary Connexion of the parts of *Chriſt* with each other, the Blood of *Chriſt*, the Soul, *&c.* are all rendred preſent, under the Species of Bread; ſo that if this Sacrament be once Adminiſtred under the Species of Bread, it were a needleſs repetition to adminiſter the ſame under the Species of Wine; for this were no other then to Adminiſter to the ſame perſon, one and the ſelf-ſame thing twice, without addition or diminution, which would not be available to the Receiver.

The Third Reaſon: Becauſe by the words of *Chriſt*, our Redeemer, Eternal Life is annexed to the Receiving of his Body, under the Species of Bread only; *If any Man eate of this Bread, he ſhall live for ever*: and again, *He that eateth of this Bread ſhall live for ever.* Where no mention is made of Receiving, under the Species of Wine, and yet Eternal life is

John 6. v. 51. Verſ. 58.

promiſed to him that eateth of this Bread; therefore, to Receive *Chriſt*, under the Species of Wine, is not neceſſary to Salvation; not *neceſſitate medii*; becauſe the Bread alone is ſufficient, as appears by the words of *Chriſt*: Nor *Neceſſitate præcepti*; becauſe no ſuch Precept is extant; and if there were, then the eating of the Bread alone would not be ſufficient to Salvation, which *Chriſt* himſelf affirms to be ſufficient.

The Fourth Reaſon: Becauſe it hath ever been the practice of the Church, ſince the Apoſtles time, to Adminiſter the Communion under the Species of Bread only, to thoſe that were infirm, and reduced to imminent danger of death, for to theſe the Sacrament was uſually carryed under one Species only; ſo likewiſe in Armies, before a Battel was to be fought, the Sacrament was commonly Adminiſtred to them only in one kind; neither is it to be preſumed, that the Church, in its greateſt purity, would, not only countenance men

men to transgress against *Christ*'s Precept, but be Instrumental also themselves, to the violating of his Commands: whence it follows, That *Christ* laid no such Precept upon his Church, nor the Members thereof.

The Fifth Reason: Because in the *Apostles* time, one Species was in use, according to the opinion of diverse of the Fathers, who hold, that *Christ* gave the Communion in one kind, to the two Disciples that were with him at *Emaus*. So *Augustin*, *Hierom*, *Chrysostom*, and *Theophylact*.

Others say, That the meaning of that place, *And they continued stedfastly in the Apostles Doctrine, and Fellowship, and in breaking of Bread, and in Prayers*, is of this Sacrament, *Acts* 2. *v.* 42. As also that, *And upon the first day of the week, when the Disciples came together to break Bread*, &c. *Acts* 20. *v.* 7. Where, by breaking of Bread, they understand the Receiving of the Sacrament.

Theſe Texts, and the Reaſons above mentioned, we ſhall examine, when we come to the Solution of their Objections.

SECT. II.

SECT. II.

The Deciſion of this Controverſie.

IN order to the Reſolution of this Queſtion, a threefold Precept is here to be diſtinguiſh'd. There is a Poſitive, a Negative, and a Mixt Precept; The firſt is a Command of Practice, for ſome poſitive action is to be exerciſed for the fulfilling of a Poſitive Precept. As by the Fifth Precept of the Decalogue, we are obliged to render that honor and reſpect which is due to our Parents, which we cannot fulfil meerly by abſtaining from actions of diſreſpect and contempt, but by Poſitive actions of Honor and Duty, though there is no obligation incumbent upon us, to be always in exerciſe of theſe actions, but only when occaſion requires. A Negative Precept commands us to abſtain from doing ſome poſitive thing, which is prohibited, and if the action forbidden be intrinſecally ill, then the doing of it is *prohibitum quia malum*;

if the action of it ſelf be indifferent, then to do it, is *malum, quia prohibitum.* This Negative Precept, layes a never interrupted obligation upon us, to obſerve it; as in the Sixth Commandment, by which we are obliged to do no Murther; the meaning is, that an act of Murther is not to be permitted, neither this time, nor that time, nor any other time whatſoever, neither upon this perſon, nor that perſon, nor any other perſon whatſoever; which is to be underſtood univerſally, and by a compleat diſtribution. And herein a Negative Precept differs from a Poſitive. A Mixt Precept includes both the former; of two different objects; as the firſt Precept obligeth us to acknowledg God, and not to acknowledge any thing elſe for God. And in this is grounded that diviſion of ſins, into ſins of Omiſſion, and Commiſſion. This being ſuppoſed,

The Firſt Aſſertion is, That the Ordinance of the Church of *Rome*, never to Adminiſter the Communion to the Laity, in both Kinds, is manifeſtly againſt *Chriſt*'s Precept. For Proof hereof I ſhall inſiſt upon that ſaying of

of our Saviour, *Amen, Amen, I ſay unto you, except you eate the fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you ſhall have no life in you*, John 6. v. 53. where thoſe words, *Amen, Amen*, expreſs the greateſt aſſeveration, that our Great Redeemer ever uſed, and this adds more force and energie to the ſubſequent Precept. The words cited contain a ſevere Commination, of depriving us of eternal Salvation, except we eate his Fleſh, and drink his Blood; which by the confeſſion of our Opponents, includes a Precept, though they deny that it extends to Communion under both Kinds.

Let us now examine what falls immediately under this Precept.

None but a Creature, indued with liberty, and reaſon, is capable of a Precept; for if it be poſitive, it injoyns the exerciſe of ſome free action, regulated by Reaſon; ſince neceſſaries cannot fall under any Precept. If it be Negative, it commands the avoiding of ſome poſitive action, which is in the power of Free-will to exerciſe, or not to exerciſe: we have here a poſitive Precept,

Precept, which injoyns all Christians, to eate the Flesh, and drink the Blood of the Son of Man; which affects immediately the free actions of Man, of eating and drinking, and, *in obliquo*, it determines the matter about which these free actions are to be exercised, namely, the Flesh and the Blood of the Son of Man. This matter, is not in the power of the Laity, to procure, at their pleasure, but is to be tendred to them by the Priest, which done, then it is in their free election to eate and drink, or not to eate and drink; wherefore these actions are that exercise, which the Precept immediately obligeth them to.

Neither is it left to their choice, how they are to receive this matter; for as the Legislator determines the matter, so likewise doth he determine the manner of receiving it; he doth not say indefinitely, or indeterminately, except you take or receive this matter; but explicitely, plainly, and distinctly, Except you *Eate* the Flesh, and *Drink* the Blood, *&c.* So that by this Precept, they are ty'd up, and determin'd to the very particular manner of doing it; neither doth the Law-

giver

giver ſay, Except you eate the fleſh, *or* drink the blood, *&c.* but, Except you eate the Fleſh, *and* drink the Blood, *&c.* by a Copulative, not a Disjunctive. So that he who eateth the Fleſh, under the Species of Bread only, though he fulfil the firſt part of the Precept, yet he complyes not with the ſecond part; for though by eating the Fleſh, under the Species of Bread, he receives the Blood alſo, and all *Chriſt*; yet he doth not *drink* the Blood, which notwithſtanding, is as rigorouſly commanded as the firſt, and in as expreſs terms.

To confirm this, I ſhall, in the next Aſſertion, make it appear, that in drinking the Chalice, there is a different ſignification, and a peculiar benefit; which accrues to the Receiver, very diſtinct from all that which iſſues from the receiving under the Species of Bread. Which much commends the great love of our dear Redeemer to Mankind, in Commanding us to Receive under both Species, that ſo he might give us an entire, and compleat repaſt, and refreſh us with all thoſe Graces, which correſpond to each part thereof: he doth not invite us to this

Banquet

Banquet of all Delicious Rarities, with intention to feed our Souls by piecemeale, and by halves; but abundantly poureth forth the Treaſures of his Merit, and Satisfaction, ſo to repleniſh our Souls with a full and compleat refection.

And to make us the more ſenſible hereof, he choſe to ſuffer that Ignominious Death upon a Croſs, and to permit the effuſion of his moſt Sacred Blood, though he could have wrought our Redemption without either; for though, as purely God, he was not capable of Satisfaction, nor Merit; yet that Divine Word, having by the Hypoſtatical Union, aſſumed Humane Nature, all his actions became Theandrical, the leaſt whereof was of an infinite value, capable (without Death or Paſſion) to Redeem a Thouſand Worlds; for though he aſſumed the Nature of Man, yet he took not upon him the Perſonality of Man; there was but one Suppoſitum which was the Divine Hypoſtaſis of the Word of God; and this gave the poyſe and value to all his actions, which proceeded from one Perſon that was both God and Man; as they proceeded from Man they

they were capable of Merit, and Satisfaction; and as they proceeded from God, they were infinite in both kinds, and ſo never to be exhauſted. So that by one act of love, or any other Moral Vertue, he might efficaciouſly have Redeemed us; and yet he choſe to do it, by a bitter Death, and Paſſion, the better to accommodate himſelf to the weakneſs and imbecillity of our capacity; for this more efficaciouſly ſtrikes our fancy, and imprints upon our Souls a more ſenſible feeling of his infinite Love towards us. And for a more ample teſtimony hereof, he hath left us his Sacred Body and Blood, to participate thereof; and to taſte of the fulneſs of his Graces and Mercies, thereby ſtill renewing the Memory of his Paſſion.

Who then ſhall abridge us of theſe Favors, by preſcinding the one halfe, and mincing the benefits beſtow'd upon us, by ſo liberal and munificent a Hand? How great is the preſumption of ſome Men? who call all *Chriſt*'s Actions in queſtion, and ſubmit them to the ſcrutiny of their weak indagation. They uſurp his Infallibility, they alter and change his Sacraments, they Repeal his

his Laws, they diſpenſe in his Precepts, and Impoſe upon him what he never Ordained: *Chriſt* ſaith, *Except ye drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye ſhall have no life in you.* The Church of *Rome* ſaith, Though ye drink not the Blood of the Son of Man, ſo you eate his Body, ye ſhall have life in you. Whom ſhall we believe, *Chriſt*, or the Church of *Rome?* Shall we deſert a certain Infallibility, to adhere to an uncertain and preſumptive one? Could not the All-knowing Word of God (whoſe Prudence and Wiſdom hath no bounds) foreſee all the Inconveniences, that could, or would come to paſs? And, Could not his Infinite Providence order and diſpoſe all for the beſt? Is it to be preſumed that *Chriſt* left his Work imperfect, or not duly order'd, to be compleated, or reformed by the weak induſtry of Man? Wherefore, by what hath been ſaid, I conclude, That the practice of the *Roman* Church, in denying the Chalice to the Laity, is an expreſs violation of *Chriſt*'s Precept.

The Second Aſſertion: This kind of half-Communion, Prohibiting the Sacrament

Sacrament under both Kinds, is a high Injuſtice, and very prejudicial and injurious to the Receiver. This Aſſertion I prove firſt, becauſe all the Laity, yea and the Clergy alſo, that are not Prieſts, are rendred uncapable of fulfilling *Chriſt*'s Precept, at leaſt as long as they ſhall remain in their Communion; and though the Authors of this Prohibition are highly culpable, and very unjuſt, in denying the Faithful what *Chriſt* hath left them, yet the Receivers alſo are tranſgreſſers for not fulfilling *Chriſt*'s Precept. But you will ſay, How can they help themſelves, if the Prieſt refuſeth to exhibit the Sacrament to them in both Kinds? which is not in their power to procure; neither can they be obliged to impoſſibilities. I Anſwer, That they who ſeriouſly endeavor to fulfill *Chriſt*'s Precepts, are bound in Conſcience to forſake the Communion of that Church, and to Imbrace the Communion of the *Proteſtant* Church, where theſe Sacred Myſteries will be compleatly Adminiſtred to them, for by this means they are capable of complying with *Chriſt*'s Command, which they are ſtrictly obliged to do.

The

The Second Proofe: They who never receive thoſe Holy Rites but in one Kind, not only tranſgreſs againſt *Chriſt's* Command, but alſo incur the penalty that is annexed to it, which is no leſs than the privation of eternal happineſs, *Except you eate the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you ſhall have no life in you.* And what is conſequent hereto, they are liable to the everlaſting torments of Hell. How enormous therefore muſt the Injuſtice be of thoſe that are Inſtrumental: What do I ſay, *inſtrumental*, that are the principle cauſe of reducing men to that extremity, that unavoidably they muſt violate *Chriſt's* Command; and thereby incur eternal damnation; and all this by denying them that, which by *Chriſt's* Inſtitution, they have right to? Can any Injuſtice be compared to this? Can any damage be more prejudicial and injurious to the Receiver?

The Third Proof: The Sacramental products of Communion, under the Species of Wine, are very different and heterogeneal from all the Graces and Favors

Favors conferr'd upon him, that participates the Sacrament, in the other kind only; for this Spiritual refection hath a great analogy, and proportionable similitude, with the natural repast of the Body, and their respective operations, are reciprocal correlatives (by way of similitude) with each other; and therefore the Original Instituter, adapting these Mysteries, to the procedure of Nature, congruously Instituted them under the Symboles of Bread and Wine; the Bread we esteem to be the Staffe of Mans Life, because it Administers such vital and animal Spirits, as are the substantial support of Mans Life: and thereby it gives aliment, vigor, and growth to the body, which is the principal part of nutrition. The Wine makes the heart glad, and enlivens it, to exercise the functions incident to human imploy, with more life and expedition; it also supplies the radical heat and moisture with seasonable accesses of its innate qualities, it delibutes the vessels and organs, which are the vehicles of the Spirits, and furnishes them with such proportionable qualities, as are most accommodated to expediate the exercise of their nutritive

Functions, by compleating the diſpoſition, which the œconomy of Nature intends for nutrition, by their attractive, diſpoſitive, converſive, and expulſive faculties; and ſo conduceth in a high degree, to nutrition, augmentation, and ſenſation. So the Bread adminiſtreth the ſubſtantial matter, that is to be wrought upon, but the qualities of Wine give their immediate aſſiſtance, in all the elaboratories which it paſſeth through, to diſpoſe it, and bring it to its intended end.

In like manner, by the primary Inſtitution of this Sacrament, thoſe Graces that are drawn from the Maſs of *Chriſt*'s Merits, are not inconſiderately diſtributed, but *in pondere & menſura*, with a due regard to the exigency of circumſtances; for though increaſe of Inherent and Sanctifying Grace, be common to both parts of this Sacrament, yet the Actual Graces, which are annexed to the one part, are far different from thoſe that correſpond to the other; for Communion under the Species of Bread, Communicates to the Receiver ſuch Actual Graces, as tend to the ſubſtance of the Spiritual, and Supernatural Life of the Soul; they incline

cline the underſtanding to a firm adheſion to the Principles of Faith, they move the Will to the practice of Moral Vertues, Piety, and Religion, both towards God and Man. But Communion under the Species of Wine, gives proportionable Graces, which though they are vers'd about the ſame matter, yet their tendency towards thoſe vertues, is in a different manner, for they excite the faculties of the Soul, to the exerciſe of Chriſtianity, with cheerfulneſs and alacrity; they give perſeverance and longanimity; they induce the Will to practiſe Vertue, and Religion, out of the higheſt Motive, of the Love of God above all things. Theſe are the Graces, which put the laſt accompliſhment to our Spiritual Actions, without which, the former, though they come full fraught with the ſubſtantial and conſiſtent Element of a Spiritual Life, yet in the execution thereof, they are dull and flaccide, and for want of a more vigorous excitation, are the ſooner defeated by adverſe Temptations, and Suggeſtions of the Senſual Appetite.

Hence we may gather, how much more a whole and adequate Communion, conduceth to the accompliſhment of a Spiritual Life, then an inadequate, and half one; for what emolument is it to one to receive a ſtrong, and ſubſtantial food, if his vital faculties are not duly qualified to digeſt it, and converte it into his proper ſubſtance? And I would have it obſerv'd, that this Doctrine of the different Graces correſponding to the receiving this Sacrament, under the two different Species, is no product of my weak invention, but is the conſtant Poſition of diverſe Learned and Approved Divines of the Church of *Rome*; and without which, their Principles of the Sacrifice of the Maſs cannot be well managed, as I ſhall ſhew anon.

And in this is grounded the ſubſtance of this Third Proof: For if we duely ponder, of how great a conſideration, and value, theſe ſpecial Graces are in themſelves, which correſpond to the Chalice, and how conducing they are to the perfection of a Spiritual Life, and fencing the Soul, againſt

againſt the ſubtile attempts of its Enemies, it will be the manifeſt ground of a cleer illation, that to deprive ſo many thouſands of ſuch unſpeakable benefits, is a great Injuſtice, and a conſiderable prejudice to thoſe, in whoſe favor, the Meritorious cauſe of them, had with ſo much bounty and liberality, left them as a Legacy, to all ſuch as ſhould worthily receive his moſt Sacred Blood, under the Species of Wine. The Pope in his Oeconomy, and the Adminiſtration of his Juriſdiction, ſeems wholly unmindful of Diſtributive Juſtice; for to ſome, by his Jubilies, Pardons, and Indulgences, he very liberally diſpoſeth of *Chriſt*'s Satisfaction, upon conſideration of their complyance with the Orders of His Holineſs; though he be ſparing enough to others. But in arrogating to himſelf a Power of diſpenſing *Chriſt*'s Merits, and the fruits of his Paſſion; yea, and to alter *Chriſt* s own Inſtitution, by refuſing them to ſuch, as the Author himſelf, had ordered to receive them, is too high a preſumption: Muſt we, by Human Autority, be deprived of what, by the Divine Giver hath been conſign'd to us? this ſtands in high oppoſition with all

equity, and is beſides, an illegal uſurpation of Divine Right. But we now come to ſolve their Objections and Allegations, ſpecified in the precedent *Section*, in defence of this partial refuſal.

SECT. III.

SECT. III.

The Objections Solved.

THe firſt Objection is grounded on the Irreverence, of permitting ſome Particles of the Chalice to fall to the ground, as is ſpecified in the firſt reaſon of the contrary opinion.

Firſt, I Anſwer, That this Prohibition removes not that inconvenience, except they forbid Communion under the Species of Bread alſo, and ſo utterly exclude the Laity from any part of this Sacrament; for there are more Particles loſt from off the Bread, then from the Wine; it being not Morally poſſible to handle the Bread, without ſeparating from it ſeveral Minute Particles, which did adhere to the Maſs, and yet were not continued, but only contiguous to it, which, on the leaſt motion, fall off, whereof many are ſo ſmall, that *fugiunt viſum*, and eſpecially, when a Prieſt in Maſs, divides the

Hoaſt, in order to Conſummation; then by reaſon of the Elaſtick Vertue of the Ayre, and the reſiſting quality of the Wafer, theſe Minute Parts muſt of neceſſity be carryed beyond the extent of the corporal, and ſo loſt, which no human care, nor diligence, can prevent.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That this, and all other circumſtances, which occur in practiſe, were cleerly and certainly foreſeen by *Chriſt* himſelf, who, notwithſtanding, deemed it expedient, if not neceſſary, to iſſue forth his Command, of receiving this Sacrament in both Kinds, who knew full well how far the weak induſtry of Man could reach, to prevent ſuch inconveniences: and for ought we know, may ſend his Angels from Heaven, to collect and take care of ſuch Particles; as ſome of the adverſe Party affirm. And this may ſerve for an Anſwer to the firſt Reaſon.

The Second Objection: He that complies with a Precept, *quoad ſubſtantiam*, though he ſhould not be ſo circumſpect as to be punctual in all things, *quoad*

quoad circumſtantias, yet he may truly be deemed to have complyed with the command, and is no tranſgreſſor; but he who receives in one Kind only, receives all *Chriſt*, as well the Body as the Blood, which is the whole ſubſtance of the Precept; therefore he is no Tranſgreſſor.

I Anſwer, by diſtinguiſhing the Major; He that complyes with the Precept, *quoad ſubſtantiam*, although he obſerve not the Circumſtances, fulfils the Precept, if the Circumſtances be the Object of the Precept: I deny the Major: If the Circumſtances fall not under the Precept; I grant it: but in the preſent caſe, the eating and drinking compared to the Precept, are the very ſubſtance thereof; though in reference to the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, they are but Circumſtances; for the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, in relation to this Precept, are, *materia circa quam*, the eating and drinking are *materia quæ:* this is the very thing that is commanded, for they are the Human actions, which are immediately under Precept: the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* are the Matter about which theſe

actions

actions are verſt; for to fulfil this command, it is not ſufficient to eate and drink any thing, but it is neceſſary to eate the Body, and drink the Blood of *Chriſt*: it is not in the power of the Seculars, to procure or Conſecrate the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, but when it is exhibited to them, it is in their free election, to eate the Fleſh, and drink the Blood; which by this Precept they are obliged to. As by the Fourth Command of the Decalogue we are injoyn'd to keep holy the Sabbath day, that is, to abſtain from ſervile labor, and to exerciſe acts of devotion, but the Precept doth not determine what acts of devotion we ſhall in particular exerciſe, for this is left to our free election, either to hear Divine Service, or hear the Word of God explained, or to imploy our time in Spiritual Reading, or in Prayer and Meditation, *&c.* here the alteration of the Circumſtances, hinders not the fulfilling of the Precept; and therefore in this caſe the Argument proceeds rightly.

But our Caſe is far different, wherein the Legiſlator determines us to particular actions, and leaves it not in our

our election to change them, or to omit either of them. So he that takes the Body and Blood of *Christ*, and doth not eate the one, and drink the other, fulfils not the Precept. And this answers the Second Reason.

The Third Objection: He that receives under the Species of Bread, receives all *Christ*, and may be truly said to eate the Flesh, and drink the Blood of *Christ*, and so satisfies the Precept; according to that of *Cyprian*, *Potus & esus ad eandem pertinent rationem.* *Sermone de Cœna Domini.*

I Answer, That he who receives only under the Species of Bread, though he receive the Blood as well as the Body, yet cannot be said to drink the Blood, under that Kind; for that which is eaten, is commonly solid and consistent; but nothing can be taken by way of drinking, except it be a fluid and a liquid matter; wherefore, to receive under the Species of Bread, is not to drink the Blood of *Christ*; except you grant, that one may drink dry bread.

To

To the Authority of *Cyprian* I Anſwer, That in the ſame Sermon he endeavours to prove the Evangelical Precept of eating the Fleſh, and drinking the Blood of Chriſt, by the ſame Text; *Except you eat the Fleſh and drink the Blood*, &c. where he hath theſe words, Ibid. *Lex eſum ſanguinis prohibet, Evangelium præcipit ut bibatur*: whereby he expreſly declares his ſentiments, to be coherent with ours. In the words above cited, he rather confirms then impugnes this Doctrine; for he declares, that eating and drinking belong both to this Sacrament, which is the Spiritual refreſhment of the Soul, in the nature of one compleat Banquet, which without Drinking would be imperfect, and incompleat.

The Fourth Objection: Admit the Hypotheſis of a Precept to receive in both kinds; yet to avoid the inconveniences before-mentioned, the Superiors of the Church, according to the prudential dictates of a right Government, may, and ought to frame an Epikeia, by a grounded interpretation of the Will of the Law-giver, that if he were preſent

ſent to be conſulted herein; he would declare his intention, not to have his Law executed on ſuch hard circumſtances; which excuſes the Governours, in denying the promiſcuous uſe of the Chalice, and exempts the Subjects from being tranſgreſſors.

Firſt I Anſwer, That upon the ſame ground, they may alſo prohibit Communion under the ſpecies of Bread, for the ſame difficulties are militant for this, as well as for that, as hath been proved.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That Divine Laws admit of no Epikeia, nor interpretatation of the Divine Will, but when God commands, Man muſt obey. The reaſon is, becauſe we cannot ſuppoſe any defect in the Omniſcience of the Divine underſtanding, who perfectly penetrates all future events, and circumſtantial emergencies, before they come to paſs, with as much infallible certainty, as if they were then preſent; ſo that here is no ground at all for the prudential dictates of humane Reaſon. But humane Laws upon extraordinary accidents, may admit of an Epikeia; becauſe the wiſeſt Legiſlator among Men,

Men, is ſuppoſed to be ignorant of future contingencies, and yet ſuch may happen, wherein a rational Judgment, not byaſſed by ſiniſter Motives, may deem it imprudence, *hic & nunc* to have the Law put in execution, and therefore may rationally interpret the Will of the Law-giver, to ſuſpend the execution of the Law, under ſuch arduity.

But however ſuch caſualties may occur, yet humane Laws ſuffer no detriment thereby; for upon removal of ſuch hard circumſtances, the Law revives, and obliges to its obſervance as much as before. How then can it be conſonant to Reaſon, that meer Men ſhould not only ſuſpend the execution of a Divine Law, upon an incident occaſion, but prohibit the obſervance of it to all, but Prieſts, conſtantly, and for perpetuity; ſo that all but Prieſts are debarr'd from the obſervance of this Law for ever? This is an attempt of a higher nature, for hereby they endeavour to abrogate and repeal this Law, as much as in them lies, for ever, which argues a bold and daring preſumption, very injurious to the Divine *Conditor Legis.*

The

The Fifth Objection is grounded in thoſe ſayings of Chriſt, where he only mentions the Bread, and promiſeth Eternal Life to them that eat it, as the Third Reaſon propoſeth. I Anſwer, That in the ſame Chapter, our Lord having diſtinctly explained his meaning more then once, of eating his Fleſh and drinking his Blood, thought it needleſs to repeat all the particulars, as often as he mentioned this Sacrament: ſo that the meaning of thoſe Texts is, he that eateth this Bread worthily, and in the manner as I ſhall preſcribe, or as I have preſcribed, ſhall live eternally; otherwiſe, if the meer eating of that Bread were ſufficient to Salvation, then an unworthy Receiver might be ſure of Eternal Life, which illation all muſt reject. And this anſwers the Third Reaſon. *John 6.*

The Sixth Objection is drawn from the practiſe of the Church, in its primitive and pureſt times, which was to adminiſter this Sacrament to thoſe that were to fight a battle, and to ſuch as were in danger of death by infirmity, in one kind only, whence it enſues, that both kinds are not neceſſary, nor under precept, which is the Fourth Reaſon.

I Anſwer, That the precept which we inſiſt upon being poſitive, it doth not oblige to receive under both kinds, *toties quoties*, neither doth it determine how often we are to receive under both kinds, but leaves this to the determination of the Church, and the Piety and Devotion of the Receiver; ſo that by Receiving ſome times in our Life, or ſo often every year, under both kinds, we fulfil the precept, and that being done, the receiving afterwards under one kind, can be no violation of the precept, it being an act of Devotion not prohibited; but he that never receives under both kinds, all his life time, is a manifeſt tranſgreſſor. And ſo the Fourth Reaſon is anſwered.

The Seventh Objection is in ſubſtance the ſame with the former, only this induceth the authority of the Fathers, upon the Texts cited in the Fifth Reaſon; where by breaking Bread, they underſtand this Sacrament. I Anſwer, That the Diſciples in thoſe times lived in common, and gave up their Temporals into the common ſtock, and took their refection in common, ſo that

that their coming together to break Bread, means, their Meeting together to take their Corporal repaſt. However the Receiving under one Kind, upon particular occaſions, proves juſt nothing, in order to this queſtion, becauſe the Precept may, at other times be fulfilled, by receiving under both Kinds, which the Fathers no way impugne.

But if you conſult the Fathers, you ſhall find many of them abetters of this Opinion. *Chriſoſtom* ſpeaking of the practiſe of the Old Law, wherein it was not lawful for the people, to participate of that part that was reſerved for the Prieſt, adds theſe words, *Sed nunc non ſic: verum omnibus unum corpus proponitur, & unum poculum.* *Gelaſius Papa* ſpeaking of the *Manachæans*, ſaith thus, *Comperimus quod quidam, ſumpta tantummodo corporis Sacri portione, à calice Sacri cruoris abſtineant, qui proculdubio, quoniam neſcio qua ſuperſtitione docentur, obſtringi, aut Sacramenta integra percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur, quia diviſio unius & ejuſdem myſterii, ſine grandi ſacrilegio non poteſt provenire.*

Chriſoſt. Hom. 18. in poſter Corinth.

Gelaſius apud Gratian Cap. Comperimus de Conſecrat. diſt. 2.

Leo. Serm. 4. de Quadrages.

And of the ſame Opinion is *Leo Pa-pa*, with others.

And this proves the Fifth Reaſon Inſufficient.

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.

Corallaries drawn from the Romaniſts *Doctrine of their pretended Sacrifice of the Maſs.*

IT is the uſual practiſe of our Antagoniſts, when they apprehend any Dogmatical Point conducing to their intended deſign, they caſt about them, and ſummon all the ſtrength of Arguments they can muſter up, to eſtabliſh that Principle. But if the ſame Poſition, in another occaſion, ſtand in their way, and obſtruct the evincing of ſome other Theſis, then they, with all ſedulous induſtry, apply themſelves to depreſs, and cry down the ſame Point, which they had before, ſo elaborately ſtrived to make good. As in this ſubject, to make out the legality of their half Communion, How do they endevor to deveſt the drinking of the Blood, of all its Prerogatives, and particular Graces, peculiar to that kind alone, as though it were ſuperfluous;

and after receiving under the Species of Bread, it were but *actum agere*, to Administer the Chalice? Yet when they treat of their Sacrifice of the Mass, then the consummating of the Chalice is held in great veneration, and esteemed so necessary, that rather then omit it, they must lay hold of any hard shift, and have recourse to extremities; for which no reason can be alleaged, except they grant the Chalice its due, and allow its efficacy and operation, as proper to it self, which in this Discourse we shall make plainly appear.

The approved notion of a Sacrifice is this, *Immutatio facta circa rem aliquam creatam in agnitionem Supremi Dominii.* It is a change made about some created thing, in acknowledgment of the Supreme Dominion; and according to this definition they infer the Mass to contain *verum, proprium, & propitiatorium Sacrificium*, as the Council of *Trent* declares, A true, proper, and Propitiatory Sacrifice; for in the Consecrating of the Bread and Wine, there is a proper Conversion, or Transmutation, of the same, into the Body and Blood of *Christ*, and these are also consummated

Council. Trid. in profession. fidei.

ſummated by the Sacrificater: all which is performed, by way of a Commemoration of that bloody Sacrifice, whereby the Author of Life offer'd himſelf upon the Croſs, to his eternal Father, as a Propitiation, for the ſins of Mankind.

Yet to compleat this unbloody Sacrifice, it is not ſufficient, that the Prieſt do conſummate the Hoaſt, under the Species of Bread, but it is alſo rigorouſly, and indiſpenſably neceſſary, that he alſo conſummate the Chalice, under the Species of Wine, and therefore, in caſe a Prieſt, after having Conſecrated the Bread and Wine, and Conſummated the Hoaſt, ſhould by any ſudden accident, or indiſpoſition of Body, fall down at the Altar, and be rendred wholly unable of Conſummating the Chalice, under the Species of Wine, in this caſe they are to uſe all poſſible means, ſuddenly to procure another Prieſt, and if none could be found that are faſting, yet rather then faile, they muſt appoint one that is not faſting, to Conſummate the Chalice (and yet without ſuch an immergent neceſſity, it is eſteemed a heinous crime, for any one to preſume, to receive this Sacra-

ment, except he be faſting) the reaſon hereof is, becauſe the Sacrifice ſhould not remain imperfect; for the Offering up an incompleat Sacrifice to the Author of all Being, is held a great abomination, and a diſreſpect to God, and therefore a leſs inconvenience muſt yield to a greater; for, *ex duobus malis, minus eſt eligendum.*

This being ſo, I now come to examine the ground of this indiſpenſable neceſſity. Why is the Conſummating the Chalice ſo rigorouſly requir'd? They Anſwer, To compleat the Sacrifice. I again demand, What is wanting, to the compleating the Sacrifice? They Anſwer, The Receiving under the Species of Wine, which, in this Sacrifice hath been Conſecrated. Here I muſt alledge their own Arguments, which they ſo induſtriouſly urge, to excuſe their denying the Chalice to the Laity For, ſay they, he who receives under the Species of Bread, receives all *Chriſt*; not only the Body, but the Blood of *Chriſt*, the Natural Union, the Divine Word, the Hypoſtatical Union, and the whole Trinity; therefore to receive again under the Species of Wine

is

is ſuperfluous; it is *actum agere*, he had all before, and more he cannot have; ſo that the ſecond reception, is but a bare repetition of the former, without addition, or diminution.

This Doctrine (which is their own) I apply to their Sacrifice. When the Prieſt hath Conſecrated in both Kinds, and Conſummated the Hoaſt, I ſtill preſs to know, What is wanting to compleat their Sacrifice? Nothing can be aſſign'd, but the Conſummating the Chalice. But I Reply, The Sacrificater hath already Received all *Chriſt*, nothing excepted, What would he have more? for, to Conſummate the Chalice, is but to receive the very ſame again; it is but an unneceſſary Repetition; it is *actum agere*, whereby nothing is received, but what was received before; and therefore if any thing be wanting to Compleat the Sacrifice, it muſt be ſome Spiritual Benefit, or Emolument that the Chalice brings with it. In fair Arguing, ſome reality ſhould be aſſigned, for bare words are not ſatisfactory; and if they pretend, that there are any peculiar Graces, or Spiritual Favors, which

accrew to the Receiver, under the Species of Wine, distinct from those that are received by Communion, under the Species of Bread (as many of their great Divines affirm) then they give a Legal Reason of *Christ*'s so much inculcating the receiving of this Sacrament under both Kinds. *Amen, Amen, dico vobis, nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis & biberitis ejus sanguinem, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Bibite ex hoc omnes. Accipite hoc & dividite inter vos* &c. And by this, they may give a rational account, why they so strictly exact the consummating of the Chalice, in their Mass.

Johannis 6 v. 53. Mat. 26. v. 27. Luc. 22. v. 17.

But if they grant this, How then can they excuse their Injustice of denying the Cup to the Laity? for these Graces are of a high value, and of right belong to them, as is more largely declared above, in this Disputation. So that they are here reduced to this perplexity: If they grant these Spiritual Graces to the Chalice, they cannot excuse their Injustice to the Laity. If they deny them, they cannot make out their practise and Doctrine of their Sacrifice of the Mass. These are hard

Sect. 2.

shifts

ſhifts to defend a bad Cauſe; but certainly they have moſt reaſon, who candidly acknowledge, the Graces conferred upon us, by receiving the Blood of *Chriſt*, under the Species of Wine, which ſo much conduce to the right Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Life, and perſeverance in it.

Let us therefore caſt a glance of compaſſion, on the deplorable condition of thoſe, that live in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, who not only are deprived of ſuch Spiritual Graces and Favors, but by a conſtant Rebellion againſt *Chriſt*'s Commands, are become refractory and incorrigeable in their diſobedience, and which is worſt of all, hereby incur the penalty threatned to the diſobedient, by *Chriſt* himſelf; which is no leſs then eternal Damnation; neither is it poſſible (as long as they remain in thoſe circumſtances) to make their Peace or Attonement with Allmighty God; which can never be effected but by a valid Abſolution, or a true Repentance; but if they reſolve to continue in that Communion, they are neither capable of a valid Abſolution, nor a true Repentance;

tance; for two eſſential impediments that cannot be removed, obſtruct and render ineffacicous all their endeavors. The one is an incapacity of retractation, the other an impoſſibility of a purpoſe of amendment: for, How is it poſſible for any one to retract his ſin, or purpoſe to amend, as long as he is deliberately, and firmly reſolved, to continue in the ſame ſin? for ſuch a reſolution, is wholly inconſiſtent with a retractation, and with a purpoſe to amend, and yet theſe two are both neceſſary to a valid Abſolution, and to a true Repentance, which is allowed by all.

I ſhall therefore conclude this Diſputation with this enſuing Sillogiſme: They who are Tranſgreſſors, and uncapable of a valid Abſolution, and true Repentance, cannot be ſaved: but they who are reſolved to continue in the Church of *Rome*, are Tranſgreſſors, and incapable of a valid Abſolution, and true Repentance; *ergo*, They who are reſolved to continue in the Church of *Rome* cannot be ſaved. The Major none can deny, it being conſonant to the Doctrine of both Churches, and evident in it ſelf. The Minor hath been

been ſufficiently proved in this Diſputation. But, How diſmal, and fatal is the conſequence, to thoſe whom it concerns? They have no remedy but one, which is, to ſeparate from that Church, which reduceth them to ſuch extremities, and then they may be in a Capacity to Repent, and exerciſe Acts of Attrition, and Contrition, ſo to reduce their Souls to a better ſtate.

Diſputate IV.

Diſpute IV.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

The Preface.

AMong all the Dogmatical Points wherein the Roman *and* Proteſtant *Churches differ, none is Controverted with more Fervor, and Animoſity, then this of* Tranſubſtantiation; *the* Romaniſts *earneſtly defending it, and the* Proteſtants *as vigorouſly denying it. Beſides the Method and Manner, which the Church of* Rome *uſeth in the Explication and Proofe of this Myſtery, leads them into ſuch a labyrinth of inſuperable Difficulties, yea, and Impoſſibilities (as ſhall be here proved) that all their Pretended Infallibility, will not be able to protect them from Error;*

Error; for they make ſo great a Breach, in the Laws of Nature, and ſo impoſe upon Human Reaſon, as if rightly underſtood, the moſt credulous could never ſtretch their Belief to an Aſſent. For they move Heaven and Earth, to accompliſh their Deſign; they bring in the Divine Omnipotence, to their ſupport, and yet ſtill need more help to make out their Undertakings; the particulars whereof the following Sections will declare.

SECT. I.

The Romaniſts *Doctrine relating to* Tranſubſtantiation.

WHoever intends to make a ſtrict Inquiry, into all the Parts of this ſtrange Myſtery, muſt of neceſſity Conſult the Grounds of *Natural Philoſophy*, on which it depends; where, in the firſt place, they adhere to *Ariſtotle*, whoſe *Principles* are more accommodated to their Deſign,

ſign, then any other; for they abſolutely except againſt the Doctrine of *Carteſius*, and reject his Principles, who compoſeth this ſublunary World of one ſimple Compleat ſubſtantial Body, admitting of no ſubſtantial Compoſition, either of Matter, or Forme, or any other equivalent parts, but divides this Body into integral parts, which he reduceth to Three Claſſes;

The One he calls, *Globulos Cæleſtes*,

Another, *Materiam Subtilem*;

And the Third, *Particulas Striatas*.

All which, though according to their own Entities, are Homogeneal, yet by reaſon of their different Figures, Motions, and other Modifications, produce all that variety, and thoſe Hetorogeneal effects, which this World propoſeth to our Corporal Senſes. And though he often mentions Local Motion, Moodes, and Modifications, yet he would never admit any accident, either abſolute or modal, no firſt or

ſecond

ſecond qualities, entitatively, and really diſtinct from the ſubſtance; as his Writings ſufficiently declare; and alſo, as I have been ſeveral times informed, by Doctor *Gutſconen*, a Doctor of the Univerſity of *Lovaine*, and Canon of the Cathedral of *Liege*, who was *Des Cartes* his boſom Friend, with whom he Communicated all his Principles, before he Printed them. Who aſſured me, that *Des Cartes* was an irreconcileable Enemy to all Accidents, Moods, and Qualities, really diſtinct from the Subſtance.

This therefore being waved, they ſtick cloſe to the Peripateticks, who admit Moods, Qualities, and Accidents, really diſtinct from the Subſtances which they affect.

Secondly, In all Compleat Bodies, in this Sublunary World, they admit a Subſtantial Compoſition, of Matter and Forme, ſo as that the firſt Matter, being produced by a creatain Action, is indifferent to all Formes, but depends on no one in particular; and therefore ſince the firſt Creation of the World (if we Conſult Nature) no Matter hath been produced, none deſtroyed. But on

on the contrary, the ſubſtantial Forms have a ſtrict dependance on the firſt Matter, as their proper Subject, and on ſeveral qualities and accidents, as their Natural diſpoſition, ſo that if their Matter ſhould be Annihilated, or their diſpoſition deſtroyed; by the Law of *Nature*, they could not ſubſiſt, though many of them Teach, that the Heavens, Planets, and Fixt Stars, admit of no ſuch Compoſition, but are Compleat, yea ſimple ſubſtantial Bodies, which cannot be diſſolved but only into Integral, and Homogeneal parts.

Thirdly, They Aſſert, That though according to Nature, the ſame Individual Body, cannot be in more then one place, at the ſame time; yet that by Divine Power, one and the ſame Body, may be collocated in ſeveral and diſtinct places, the ſame moment of time, how diſtant, and remote ſoever theſe places are, the one from the other. Which is far different from the Manner, how the Soul of Man exiſts in the Body, for though the ſame Soul be at the ſame time in the head, and in the foot, and becauſe it is a Spirit, and hath no ſubſtantial, nor integral parts, it muſt of

of neceſſity be all in the head, and all in the foot, and other parts of the Body, the ſame inſtant, becauſe it is indiviſible; yet, in this Caſe, the whole Body is but one adequate place of the Soul; for if the head ſhould be ſever'd from the Body, the Soul could not in that ſtate of Separation, be both in the head and the Body, no not for one moment of time.

Fourthly, They agree in the notion of Subſtantial Converſion, that it is a Tranſmutation of one Subſtance into another, which they diſtinguiſh into two Members; the one is a partial, or inadequate Converſion; the other a total or adequate Commutation. The firſt is common, and proper to the preſent order of Nature; for in all the Changes that we obſerve, of ſeveral Subſtances deſtroy'd, and others produc'd, there never happens but a partial Converſion: for example, We ſee Wood, or other Combuſtible Matter, Converted into Fire, the Form of Wood is deſtroyed, but the Matter, as being ſuſceptible of any Form, remains under the Forme of Fire, that was before under that of Wood: So that you ſee, in all theſe Converſi-

ons, one part is destroy'd, but the other persists in being; so in that which succeeds, one part is newly produced, but the other was extant before. But in a total Conversion, the precedent substance is wholly destroyed, the Matter is Annihilated, and the Forme Corrupted, and the subsequent substance, which succeeds in place of that which is destroyed, both Matter and Forme, is all Collocated under the same Collection of Accidents, either by a new production, or else by an adduction; for if this substance, into which the former was Converted, were before extant, then there needs only a new Ubication in the place, where the Conversion is made, without relinquishing its former *Ubi*, or place where it was existent; and so is now in two distinct places at once; and this total Conversion can never be made, without infringing the Laws of Nature: for nothing in Nature can ever lay a disposition, determining to the destruction of the first Matter, which depends upon no dispositions, but is produced by a Creative action, independant of all things else. And therefore its destruction

ction exceeds the power of all Natural Cauſes. Then the Conſtituting of a Body, in two diſtinct and adequate places at once, is not in the power of Nature, as all grant.

Fifthly, They grant, That Quantity, Qualities, Diſpoſitions, and all other Accidents, cannot naturally ſubſiſt without a Subject, or Receptacle to ſupport them, and keep them in being; for, as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, *Accidens eſt ens in alio*, or *entis ens*; it is ordained by Nature to be ſubſervient to ſubſtance, and ſo is not intended for it ſelf, but to diſpoſe the ſubſtance to ſeveral Changes and Mutations, upon which it hath conſequently a ſtrict dependance; neither can it have any uſe in Nature, without the Subſtance. So that Accidents cannot remain without a Subſtance, but by the Miraculous aſſiſtance of a Supernatural Power, and where this intervenes, they maintain, that all Accidents, except Moodes, may be conſerved, in being without a Subject.

Theſe ſeveral Points of Doctrine being premiſed, they conclude, That in the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, by the words of Conſecration, which are theſe,

Hoc est corpus meum, *This is my Body*; which are pronounced by the Priest, assuming *Christ*'s Person, there is wrought a total, substantial Conversion, which they call *Transubstantiation*; so that the whole substance of Bread, both Matter and Forme, is totally destroyed: and the whole substance of *Christ*'s Body is really placed there, in lieu of the Bread, which is really Converted into the Body of *Christ*, yet so, as that the Species of Bread (which is the collection of Accidents, that were before in the Bread) keep their state of being (though the Bread be destroyed) and are Miraculously preserved without a Subject; though they are Sacramentally united to the Body of *Christ*: And though, *ex vi verborum*, only the Body of *Christ* be rendred present, nothing else being signified by the words of Consecration, nor requisite to verifie that proposition; yet by a necessary Concomitance, and Connexion, whereby all the parts of *Christ* are united with each other, there is also put, under the Species of Bread, the Blood of *Christ*, the Soul of *Christ*, with the Natural

Natural Union between his Body and Soul, the Divine Word, the Hypostatical Union, which Connects the Divine Word to the Humanity, and consequently all the Sacred Trinity, are all there really Existent, under the Species of Bread; which Species or Complex of Accidents, were produced and conserved before the Bread was destroyed, by an Action called *Eduction*; that is, a production dependant on another, to wit, the Substance of Bread, to which they were the natural disposition; but that substance being destroyed, they are now conserved by another action, which they terme *Creation*; that is, a production independant of all others. By the Species of Bread they understand, the Heat, the Cold, the Dryeth, the Moysture, the Quantity, the Rarity, the Density, the Colour, the Odour, the Taste, *&c.* which were all appropriated to the Bread.

They also Affirm, That these strange Wonders are wrought by the words of Consecration, which are Instituted by *Christ*, to this purpose, and by

their Obediential Power, are elevated to effect, what of themſelves they are uncapable of, the Divine Power Co-operating with them, to accompliſh this deſign; ſo that theſe few words, pronounced by a Prieſt, who aſſumes *Chriſt*'s Perſon, and Officiates in his Name, are not only repreſentative, but alſo practical; they effect what they ſignifie, and ſo reduce themſelves to a Conformity with their Object, which makes them true.

But it may be demanded, In what Critical Moment of time this great Change is made? For the words, though few, yet are pronounced by the Prieſt ſucceſſively, whence the doubt ariſeth, Whether this ſtrange Converſiſion, be made in the beginning, the middle, or the end of the words of Conſecration? To this they Anſwer, That during the time that the Prieſt is pronouncing thoſe words, nothing is done, till he pronounceth the laſt Syllable of the laſt word *meum*, and in that moment the whole buſineſs is effected, and the Prieſt no ſooner hath ſpoken

ſpoken that laſt ſyllable, but he kneels to Adore *Chriſt* then preſent, and Elevates the Hoaſt, to ſhew it to the People, that they alſo may adore it.

Another Query may be propoſed, How long the Body of *Chriſt* remains in the Hoaſt, under the Species of Bread? Their Anſwer is, That as long as the diſpoſitions of Bread remain there, ſo long is *Chriſt* preſent; but when by contrary Cauſes, theſe Qualities, and Accidents are ſo far Changed, that the Forme of Bread could not Naturally there ſubſiſt, then the Body of *Chriſt* is withdrawn.

This is a ſhort, but true Account of their Tenets: whence they Conclude, That by ſuch a *Tranſubſtantiation*, as is above explicated, the ſubſtance of Bread is truly and really Converted into the Body of *Chriſt*; and this they propoſe to all to be Believed, as an Article of Faith.

The Grounds of this Paradoxi-

cal Doctrine we shall propose in the Objections, against those Assertions which we are going to establish in the next *Section.*

SECT. II.

The Orthodox Doctrine againſt Tranſubſtantiation *propoſed and proved.*

THE Firſt Aſſertion: The Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it is Taught by the Church of *Rome*, is *de facto*, falſe, and Erroneous. I add thoſe words *de facto*, becauſe in this Concluſion, I only deſign to prove, That no ſuch *Tranſubſtantiation* is actually to be admitted, waving the poſſibility of it; but I ſhall afterwards prove that it is wholly Chymerical, and Impoſſible, and the Proofs of that Aſſertion, will confirm this.

The Firſt Proofe; *Chriſt* came not into the World to deſtroy, but to edifie, and therefore was ſo zealous to fulfil the Old Law; and certainly he ſtood not in oppoſition with his Eternal Father, who was the great Framer, and Conſerver of the Univerſe, who conſtituted it in its due order, by providing for

for the proper Nature, propensions, and inclinations of each part thereof, by ordaining the Natural Causes, Effects, Proprieties, and Passions of all things, and by that provident subordination of one thing to another, in relation to the good and conservation of the whole. But this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* cannot be defended, but by violating those Laws of Nature (established by God himself) in a high degree, for in every Consecration, there are as many Miracles, which infringe the Laws of Nature, as there are Minute Accidents, and Qualities existing without their Subject; it is a Miracle that the Forme of Bread should be destroyed, and its disposition entire, contrary to the exigence of Nature; it is a Miracle, and against Nature, that the first Matter should be annihilated, nothing in the Universe determining to it; it is a Miracle that the Body of *Christ* should be in so many places the same time; it is a Miracle, that the Words of Consecration (a meer Sound from a Mans Organ) should be elevated to effect such Prodigies. And in most places subject to the See of *Rome*, there is a never interrupted continuation of all these Miraculous

raculous products, by keeping the Consecrated Hoast in a Cyborium, within the Tabernacle, which is never intermitted. Nay, What a Prodigious Number of Miracles are daily and hourly multiplyed, by so many Millions of Hoasts as are continually Consecrated, in the whole extent of the Universe? Who can be so impious, as to impute so horrid a Fraction in Nature, to *Christ* himself? as though he waged War with his Eternal Father, by endeavoring to subvert the Order, and Nature of this Universe, contrary to its first Institution; all which being duely considered, who can be so great a Contemner of his own Reason, as blindly to inslave it to such incredible Doctrine?

The Second Proof: If the Substance of Bread were really Transubstantiated into the Body of *Christ*, and the Species of Bread should remain without a Subject, that Collection of Species would be wholly incorruptible; and consequently *Christ*'s Body would never be separated from that Hoaste, where it is once present. The Illation I prove evidently, for if that Collection

on of Accidents exiſt independant of any Subject, and are preſerv'd by a Creative Action, then no Natural Cauſe, nor Agent, could have any influence upon them, for no Natural Agent can operate, but in order to ſome Subject, which muſt receive and ſupport the effect produced: wherefore admit that a Conſecrated Hoaſte were applyed to the fire, the Species of Bread extant in the Hoaſte, would ſuffer ſome Change, or Alteration, by the influence of the fire; ſuppoſe then one degree of heate to be produced in the Hoaſte, then one degree of cold muſt be expelled from thence, which is the contrary to heate; if ſo, then that degree of Heate which the fire produced, muſt be Created, and not Educted, becauſe there is no ſubject at all to receive it, and ſo it muſt exiſt as the reſt of that Complex doth, independant of a Subject: and that degree of cold that is deſtroyed, muſt be annihilated, not corrupted, for it is deſtroyed independant of any Subject. What then, to maintain this Doctrine, Muſt we admit that a meer Creature, and a Natural cauſe, as the Fire, hath a power to create, and annihilate? you were as good ſay, that

a

a Creature may be Omnipotent, for hitherto I never heard but of one Creator, God himſelf, who alone hath power to Create, and Annihilate: What is this but to rob God of his Prime Attributes, and communicate them to his Creatures? But, What remedy? for manifeſt experience ſheweth, that a conſecrated Hoaſte is as liable to alteration, change, and corruption, as another that is not conſecrated; ſo there is no way but one, to ſalve all theſe inconveniences, which is, by denying *Tranſubſtantiation*, out of which thoſe groſs errors inevitably follow.

But it may be Objected, That the proper Subject of the Species of Bread, is the quantity, and not the ſubſtance it ſelf, for the quantity is the ſubject of other qualities, and common accidents, and that alone is Miraculouſly conſerved in the Euchariſt, without a ſubject.

Firſt, I Anſwer, That the proper function of quantity is to communicate impenetrability to the Bodies that it affects, for two Bodies meeting together, reſiſt each other, and cannot be both

both penetrated in the ſame place, as our Soul is with our Body. This proceeds from quantity, which is the root of impenetrability. Beſides, that is the ſubject of the common accidents, which is by them diſpoſed for ſeveral Formes; but it is only the ſubſtance that is ſo diſpoſed (for quantity is of it ſelf but an accident) therefore the common accidents are received in the ſubſtance, and not in the quantity.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That all the School of the *Thomiſts*, all the School of the *Scotiſts*, and a great part of the *Jeſuites*, and other Authors, of the Church of *Rome*, do abſolutely aſſert, that the ſubſtance, and not the quantity, is the proper ſubject of the common accidents, and conſequently the Argument proceeds in its full ſtrength againſt all theſe.

The Third Proof: Inſiſting upon the Principles of *Tranſubſtantiation*, an irreconcileable difficulty will occur; when that complex of firſt, and ſecond qualities, and other accidents is ſo altered, and changed, that it becomes an apt diſpoſition to a new ſpecifical Forme.

Forme. As for example: A Communicant receives a conſecrated Hoaſte, which is log'd in the Stomach of the Receiver, and by the natural activity of the Stomach is fitly diſpoſed to receive the Forme of Chyle, then there is a ſtrict exigence in nature, that the Forme of Chyle be introduced; What is to be done in this caſe? Nature may ſpend it ſelf in clamoring to have this Forme introduced, but alaſs, here is no ſubject, nor receptacle to receive it. Some expedient muſt here be found, you will ſay, that in this caſe the Author of Nature muſt create new Matter, to receive this Forme, and to relieve the Accidents from that violent ſtate wherein they have been detained.

Moſt excellent *Philoſophy!* How abſurd would this ſeem to any of the Antients, but meanly verſt in this Science? *Ariſtotle* never dreamt of ſuch anxieties and diſtreſſes of Nature. And the *Divinity* is yet worſe; which makes God ſubject to ſubmit to the extravagant exigences of his creatures, no way grounded in his own Providence, and Diſpoſition; for the great Author of Nature, Created the whole Maſs of firſt Matter,

Matter, independant of any thing else, and since that original creation, no Matter hath been destroyed, none produced, but the same succeeds indifferently, to all the variety of Formes that are produced and destroyed. But now here comes a strict exigence of a substantial Forme, to be produced dependant on the Matter, and yet there is no matter to receive it, but the Supreme Creator must be summoned by his creatures to supply this defect, by Creating new Matter, as though he had been ignorant in the Beginning, what quantity of Matter was sufficient, who created all things by his Infinite Wisdom, and Providence, *in pondere, & mensura*, out of his own Free-will, without any exigence, or determination of his creatures.

Must then the Order of this Systeme be inverted? and God, (as it were) necessitated, to exercise his Omnipotence in a New creation, not grounded in his former Institution?

But here it may be Alleg'd, That the drift of all these Proofes, is no other,

other then to make it appear, that the whole buſineſs of *Tranſubſtantiation* is Supernatural and Miraculous, which the Church of *Rome* freely acknowledgeth, and are induced to this belief, by the Autority of *Chriſt* himſelf, who, holding Bread in his hand, in the Laſt Supper, plainly told his Apoſtles, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, *This is my Body:* If *Chriſt* affirms it, Who dares gainſay it? We all know, that the Subſtance of Bread cannot, by Natural Means, be converted into the Body of *Chriſt*, but by the illimited power of God, it may be done; and *Chriſt* tells us, That it is done, Why therefore ſhould we not believe it?

Firſt, I Anſwer, That what is poſſible, though Miraculous, and Supernatural, may be believed, yet not ſlightly, and without ſufficient reaſon; but if by an urgent and indiſpenſable neceſſity, or an irrefragable autority, which brings with it a perfect aſſurance, of the true ſenſe, and meaning thereof, we are preſſed to an aſſent, this is a ſufficient Motive to induce us to believe

But, in the next Proofe, I ſhall make it appear, that here is no ſuch inductive, no neceſſity of yielding our aſſent to ſuch a prodigious number of Miracles, not once only, but daily and hourly repeated, and conſtantly continued, and ſo to laſt till the Worlds end.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That in the Second Proofe of this Aſſertion, it appeareth, that from this Doctrine of *Transubſtantiation*, it unavoidably follows, That all Natural Cauſes, both can and do actually create, and annihilate, who promiſcuouſly have their influences, when duly applyed, upon a conſecrated Hoaſte, as much as they have upon one that is not conſecrated; which plain experience maketh manifeſt; and to have ſuch a power to create and annihilate, or to produce ſomething out of nothing, is ſo peculiar to God alone, as wholly depending on an Omnipotent Power, that it is abſolutely impoſſible, that it ſhould be communicated to any pure creature.

The

The Fourth Proofe: There is no neceſſity, neither from Scripture, nor Reaſon, nor from any other Revelation, to admit *Tranſubſtantiation.* The greateſt neceſſity that hath been hitherto alledged, is drawn from thoſe words of *Chriſt*, *Hoc eſt corpus meum:* but from hence no neceſſity can be derived; for, they that hold *Conſubſtantiation*, and aſſert, That *Chriſt*'s Body exiſts in the Sacrament, together with the Subſtance of Bread, theſe, I ſay, as rigorouſly ſtand to the literal ſenſe of *Chriſt*'s words, and as properly verify them, as they who hold *Tranſubſtantiation*; for the words of themſelves imply no converſion, or change of one ſubſtance into another; but, if taken in a literal ſenſe, they only ſignifie *Chriſt*'s Body there preſent: wherefore there is no neceſſity, from theſe words, to multiply ſo many Miracles, yea, and Impoſſibilities, as are inferr'd from *Tranſubſtantiation*, becauſe the literal ſenſe of the words may be ſaved without them.

But in reality there is no more neceſſity of underſtanding thoſe words of *Chriſt* in a literal ſenſe, then when he ſaith, *I am a Door*, *I am a Vine*, &c.

For, ſince the Scripture is capable of ſo many Senſes and Interpretations, there is no Reaſon, nor Neceſſity, of wreſting it to that ſenſe alone, which brings with it the greateſt difficulties of any, eſpecially when by congruities, and other places of Scripture, it may be connaturally underſtood in another ſenſe; and ſince it was uſual with our Great Redeemer, to ſpeak by Allegories, Parables, by Tropes and Figures, it is moſt likely he ſpoke ſo here; which is ſufficiently intimated by *Chriſt* himſelf, telling his Diſciples, *John. 6. verſ. 63.* that, *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing; the words that I ſpeak unto you, are Spirit and Life*; and yet the words that he then ſpoke were concerning his Body.

Hence

Hence I Conclude. That the words of *Christ* above reherſed, can ground no neceſſary inference of *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Z 3 SECT. III.

SECT. III.

Of the Possibility of Transubstantiation, *as held by the Church of* Rome.

IN order to the determination of this difficulty, I must first premise, That according to the Rules of *Logick*, no affirmative proposition, or enunciation, can be true, except it have a conformity with its Object, that is, the Object must be in its self, as the act represents it.

All Enunciations consist of two parts, the subject, and the predicate; the subject is that of which it enunciates; the predicate is that which it enunciates of the subject: if the proposition be negative, it separates the predicate from the subject; but if it be affirmative, it intentionally identifies the one with the other, as in this Proposition; *Angelus est spiritus*; *Angelus* is the subject, and *Spiritus* is the predicate; the act being affirmative, represents these two as identified; and because in the

the Object they are identified, therefore the Proposition is true: But if the two extreams were not identified, yet possibly might be, then the act were *in materia contingenti*, that is, contingently false; but if they were not identified, nor by any power could be identified, then the Proposition were *in materia remota*, that is, necessarily false. This being supposed,

The Second Assertion is, That *Transubstantiation*, as grounded on the literal sense of this Proposition, *Hoc est corpus meum*, is impossible, and Chymerical.

That I may be rightly understood in the Proofe of this Assertion, I desire it may be observed, that in the progress of this discourse, I shall always take the Proposition in question, in a literal sense, according to the natural and plain signification and meaning of the words, as understood by the *Romanists* themselves, who take it literally; wherein I shall first prove the true signification of the Subject, and then of the Predicate, whence I shall cleerly deduce the truth of this Assertion.

The Subject of this Propoſition, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, is that which is ſignified by the word *Hoc*, which I thus prove to be the ſubſtance of Bread: That which was actually preſent when the word *hoc* was pronounced, is the Object or thing ſignified thereby; But the ſubſtance of Bread was the only thing preſent, when the word *hoc* was pronounced; *ergo*, the ſubſtance of Bread is the Object, or thing ſignified thereby. The firſt Propoſition, or Major, cannot be reaſonably doubted, for that particle *hoc* being demonſtrative, it indicates and ſhews its Object as preſent; for that which is abſent or not exiſtent, cannot, in any propriety of Speech, be ſignified by the word *hoc*, or *this*: as if the *Author* of a *Book* ſhould hold one of the Copies in his hand, and ſhew it to thoſe that were preſent, ſaying, *This is my Compoſition*: Could any one in his right wits doubt, but that by the word *this*, he ſignified the Book which he held in his hand? wherefore, that which *Chriſt* held in his hand, and ſhewed to his *Apoſtles*, when he ſaid, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, muſt neceſſarily be the thing ſignified by the word *hoc*.

The

The Minor, or Second Propoſition I prove thus: That which was preſent when *Chriſt* pronounced the Word *hoc*, was that which he held in his hand, and ſhewed to his *Apoſtles*, which was only Bread, under its proper Species, for in that moment, the Body of *Chriſt* was not there, under the Species of Bread, as our *Antagoniſts* themſelves confeſs, who conſtantly affirm, That the Body of *Chriſt* is not rendred preſent under the Species of Bread, till that inſtant wherein the Propoſition is compleatly ended, and the reaſon is, becauſe till that inſtant, there is nothing that ſignifieth the Body of *Chriſt*, which is made preſent by the force and energia of the ſignification of that Propoſition, which they ſay, is elevated to be iuſtrumental in producing its object, and by that means concurs to its own verity. Therefore *Chriſt*'s Body not being preſent under the Species of Bread in that inſtant, it remains, that only the ſubſtance of Bread was then preſent in *Chriſt*'s hand, and conſequently that alone was the Subject of that Propoſition, whoſe Predicate was affirmed, or enunciated of it.

The

The Predicate of the forementioned Propoſition, which is, *Corpus meum, my Body*, plainly and explicitly ſignifieth the Body of *Chriſt*, who pronounceth the Propoſition, and ſaith of that Bread, which he then held in his hand, that it was his Body, and therefore I ſhall not detain you in proving the Body of *Chriſt* to be the thing ſignified by the Predicate, eſpecially ſince our Opponents grant it, to make good their Tenet.

Having proved the true meaning and ſignification of the Subject of the forenamed Propoſition to be Bread, and our Adverſaries granting the thing re-repreſented by the Predicate to be the Body of *Chriſt*, let us now examine the ſenſe and meaning of the whole act: *Chriſt* holding Bread in his hand, ſaith, *This is my Body:* that is, this Bread is my Body, as hath been proved; and the Propoſition being Affirmative, intentionally affirms *Chriſt*'s Body to be really identified with that Bread, ſignified by the word *this*, becauſe no Affirmative Propoſition can be true, except the Subject and Predicate thereof be identified, *ex parte objecti*, for without

out this identity, the act can never be conformable to its object, wherein conſiſts the truth of it; whence it comes to paſs, that the Propoſition in Queſtion, taken in a literal ſenſe, according to the true and genuine ſignification of the words, without Tropes and Figures, cannot poſſibly be true; which I prove thus,

An identity between Bread, and the Body of *Chriſt*, is impoſſible and Chymerical; but the Propoſition in Queſtion affirms an identity between Bread and the Body of *Chriſt*; *ergo*, the Propoſition in Queſtion affirms that which is impoſſible, and chymerical. The Minor, or Second Propoſition, is plain and evident, by what hath been already proved, and granted. The Major or Firſt Propoſition, I ſhall here prove; all identity between two Subſtances ſpecifically and individually diſtinct, is as impoſſible, as a *hyrco-cervus*, or *hypocentaurus*, as they call them, that is, a down-right Chymera: the reaſon is, becauſe it involves a contradiction, whereof one Member formally deſtroys the other; for the notion of identity between two objects, conſiſts in this, That the one hath *omnia & ſola illa quæ aliud habet*;

habet, all the perfections and predicates of the other, and nothing more; but the ſubſtance of Bread hath not all the perfections and predicates of the Body of *Chriſt*, for it wants Organizations, Life, *&c.* and hath a ſpecifical forme, which *Chriſt* hath not; therefore if theſe two were identified, the one would have all that the other hath, (which idenity implyes) and the one would not have all that the other hath, by reaſon of their ſpecifical diſtinction, which is a plain contradiction, wherein the Affirmative formally deſtroys the Negative; and, *econtra*, the Negative deſtroys the Affirmative. Again, that Bread, and the Body of *Chriſt*, are individually diſtinct, and an *individuum* is that which is *indiviſum in ſe, & diviſum à quolibet alio*; indiſtinct in it ſelf, and diſtinct from all others; but if thoſe two individuals were identified, each of them would be diſtinct from all other, and would not be diſtinct from all other, which is a formal contradiction, and therefore all ſuch identities between two, are impoſſible, and chymerical, and ſo I have proved the Major of the laſt Syllogiſme; whence I conclude, that this Propoſition, *Hoc*

eſt

eſt corpus meum, taken literally, affirms that which is impoſſible, and chymerical; and therefore cannot ground a real change, or converſion; and ſo *Tranſubſtantiation*, as grounded on this Propoſition, is wholly impoſſible, and a meer Chymera.

This Proofe I efficaciouſly confirm thus: Either that Particle *Hoc* ſignifies the ſubſtance of Bread, or it doth not; if the former, then it affirms an identity between Bread, and the Body of *Chriſt*, which is a Chymera, and all the foregoing diſcourſe ſtands firm and immoveable; If the latter, then with aſſured confidence I declare, that there is not the leaſt ground or appearance of *Tranſubſtantiation* to be drawn from that ſo often reiterated Propoſition, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, which I prove evidently.

All Converſions, and Tranſmutations, whether partial or total, whether *Tranſubſtantiations*, or *Tranſaccidentations*, eſſentially import two extreams, the one is *terminus à quo*, the other, *terminus ad quem*, and a Medium that paſſeth from one to the other, as in our preſent caſe the Bread is *terminus a quo*, the

the Body of *Christ* is *terminus ad quem*, becauſe the Bread is ſaid to be Converted, or *Tranſubſtantiated* into the Body of *Chriſt*, ſo that the Bread is deſtroyed, and the Body of *Chriſt* ſucceeds in lieu thereof; the Medium is that collection of Accidents which are proper to Bread, and under which the ſubſtance of Bread exiſted before it was deſtroyed, and after, the Body of *Chriſt*, exiſts under the ſame collection of Accidents.

Now, if the foreſaid Particle *Hoc* do not ſignifie the ſubſtance of Bread, then it is moſt manifeſt, that in the whole propoſition, there is not the leaſt mention made of Bread, but only of the Body of *Chriſt*, which the Predicate expreſſeth; and the Copula, or Union, repreſents nothing, but only intentionally unites, or identifies the two extreams; and there is nothing elſe in the whole propoſition but the Subject, which is the Particle *Hoc*; therefore if this do not ſignifie Bread, then there is nothing that ſignifieth it in the whole propoſition.

Whence I infer, That the aforeſaid propoſition, doth no way ſignifie, import, or make the leaſt mention of

Tranſub-

Tranſubſtantiation, no, nor doth it afford the leaſt ground to infer it from thence, becauſe it mentions no extreams really diſtinct, no *terminum à quo*, no *terminum ad quem*, no Change, nor Tranſmutation, but only ſignifies the Body of *Chriſt* there, not as *terminum ad quem*, for this is correlative to another extreame, which is *terminus à quo*; but this it not at all ſignifieth. How then can it adminiſter any the leaſt ground to aſſert *Tranſubſtantiation*? Here I appeale to the Judgment of any indifferent, or impartial *Reader*, though but meanly capacitated, how a Propoſition can be capable to adminiſter ſuch an aſſured belief of *Tranſubſtantiation*, which notwithſtanding it doth not in the leaſt ſignifie.

It enſues therefore, That as the *Rabbies* in thoſe times did uſually ſpeak in Parables, Tropes and Figures, *&c.* So our Great Maſter (who in moſt things accommodated himſelf to the preſent times) did frequently expreſs himſelf by Parables, Emblems, Tropes, and Figures, and particularly in this paſſage, whereof the words, as you ſee, can in no ways bear a literal ſenſe, eſpecially, becauſe

becauſe we find ſo much congruity for it, in other paſſages of Scripture, where our Saviour calls it Bread, *John 6. v.* 51. *I am the living bread, if any Man eate of this bread. The bread that I will give you is my fleſh:* And, How can it be underſtood in a litteral ſenſe, that Bread ſhould be the fleſh of *Chriſt*? *v.* 58. *This is that bread which came down from Heaven*, &c. Theſe, and diverſe other ſayings of our Redeemer, can in no wayes be underſtood in the rigor of the Letter, but are to be expounded according to the congruity of the Subject; for the Bread was a fit Emblem of the Body of *Chriſt*, and equivalently the ſame, becauſe it was by *Chriſt* himſelf, elevated to be a Sacrament; and, as Bread feeds the Body of Man, ſo the Sacramental effect thereof feeds the Soul, by ſuch Spiritual Graces as incline to Vertue and Piety, and by fencing the Underſtanding and the Will againſt all Suggeſtions of Vice and Iniquity.

Again, the Body of *Chriſt*, by Offering it ſelf in that Bloody Sacrifice upon the Croſs, was the Meritorious Cauſe of thoſe Graces, and Spiritual Food of our Souls, and ſo it was congruouſly Figur'd by Bread, which feeds the Body;

Body; and for this reaſon it was fitly Inſtituted in this Sacrament, as a Commemoration of *Chriſt*'s Paſſion; and therefore our Lord himſelf tells us, *v.* 63. *That it is the ſpirit that quickneth, the fleſh profiteth nothing:* And again, *The words that I ſpeak unto you, are ſpirit and life*; and ſo ought to be underſtood, in a Myſtical ſenſe, and not according to the ſound of the Letter; for by participating of this Sacrament, we become Members of the Myſtical Body of *Chriſt*, and are, as it were, made one with him; ſo that the Bread being Inſtituted as a Sacrament, and thereby adapted to produce all theſe effects, it is equivalently the Body of *Chriſt*.

SECT. IV.

Objections for Tranſubſtantiation *Solved.*

THE Firſt Objection: In this Propoſition, *Hoc eſt corpus meum, This is my Body:* the Subject, which is the word *Hoc*, hath no determinate ſignification; for when it is pronounced, it neither repreſents the Bread, nor the Body of *Chriſt*, but its true meaning is ſuſpended, till the Propoſition be compleated, and then whatſoever is the object of the Predicate, muſt alſo be the object of the Subject; ſo that the Predicate ſignifying explicitly the Body of *Chriſt*; the Subject, or the Particle *Hoc* ſignifies the ſame implicitly; and ſo the Predicate being identify'd with the Subject, the Propoſition is true. And in this manner all definitions are predicated of the things defined; for that which the *definitum* ſignifieth implicitly, and obſcurely, the definition declares explicitly and diſtinctly.

This

This is a ſtrange kind of new Logick, which will not bear the Teſt of the weakeſt Sophiſter, nor ever get admittance into any Academy: wherefore my Firſt Anſwer is, That in all vocal Propoſitions, the ſubject hath its certain and determinate object then, when it is pronounced, whether it expreſſes the ſame clearly, or abſolutely, which is not material; for if the predicate could determine the ſubject to have the ſame object with it ſelf, no affirmative propoſition could be falſe, becauſe the ſubject, and predicate would be alwayes identified. But, in caſe of equivocation, as in this propoſition, *Canis eſt animal latrabile*; where the ſubject *canis* equally ſignifieth more things then one; for it indifferently ſignifies an Animal called a Dog, it ſignifies the Dog-Star, and it ſignifies a Dog-Fiſh: In this caſe, I ſay, the indifference of the word *canis* muſt be determined, either by the preſent circumſtances, or by the predicate; as if one with his finger ſhould ſhew an Animal called a Dog, and ſay, *hic canis*; then the indifference would be determin'd to that Species only, and the Equivocation would be taken off. So

likewiſe by the predicate, *Animal latrabile*, the indifference of the word *canis* would be determin'd to one kind only; but note, that the predicate can never draw the ſubject to ſignifie any thing beyond the extent of its proper ſignification, for the word *canis* muſt of neceſſity ſignifie one of the three kindes above ſpecified, and nothing elſe. So in the Propoſition in Queſtion, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, the word *Hoc* is determined of its own nature to ſignifie that which it then indicates as preſent, be it what it will; but can never ſignifie a thing abſent, or not then in being; much leſs can its ſignification be ſuſpended, when it is once pronounced, for here is no equivocation; but this hath no place in the Mental Propoſition of the Underſtanding, which regulates the Vocal, becauſe *in mente nulla datur æquivocatio*, there can be no equivocation in the underſtanding, to whoſe act the Vocal muſt correſpond. And if we could ſee the internal Act of him that ſpeaks (as the Angels do) all equivocation would ceaſe. What is added of a definition, in relation to the *definitum*, or thing defin'd, is of no force, for the

definitum

definitum hath its determinate ſignification, before the definition is enunciated of it; but the definition declares diſtinctly the *genus* and *differentium* of the thing defined, which the *definitum* involves in obſcurity.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That inſiſting upon the Doctrine of this Objection, no Converſion, nor Tranſmutation can be any way grounded in that Propoſition; for if the Subject, when pronounced, ſignifie nothing, and when the Propoſition is compleatly ended, it ſhould ſignifie the ſame with the Predicate, Where then could they find the extreams of Converſion? when there is but one and the ſame thing ſignified by both; no Medium expreſſed, not the leaſt intimation of a *tranſitus*, or paſſing from one extreame to another. This would ruine their main deſign, of Aſſerting *Tranſubſtantiation* as a legal inference out of that Propoſition.

But it may be Reply'd, That by the aforeſaid Propoſition, the Body of *Chriſt* is aſſerted as preſent, which was not ſo before, for it paſſeth *à non eſſe ad eſſe*, from not being, to being.

I Anſwer, That all Converſions re-

quire two poſitive termes, the one *à quo*, the other *ad quem*, but all things that are ceated, or produced, which imply no Converſion, yet the firſt inſtant of their production, is *primum quod ſic*, and the inſtant immediately before, is the *ultimum quod non*, as the *Philoſophers* terme them, which denotes, a paſſing from not Being, to a ſtate of Being; yet this imports no Converſion of one thing into another, and is therefore impertinent to ground *Tranſubſtantiation.*

The Second Objection proceeds againſt the notion of identity, as it is explicated above, *Sect.* 3. where it is ſaid, That they are identified, whereof one hath all the predicates and perfections of the other, and nothing elſe. Whence it would follow, that no affirmative Propoſition would be true, but only definitions, as this, *homo eſt animal rationale.* Man is a reaſonable ſenſible Creature; which is the whole Eſſence of Man. But the other four predicables, as *genus*, *differentia*, *proprium* & *accidens* could have no place, becauſe they produc't but part of the Eſſence, and ſo the one hath not all the perfections that the other hath; as,

Homo

Homo eſt Animal, Homo eſt Rationalis, Verbum factum eſt caro, &c.

Firſt, I Anſwer, That this Controverſie depends not upon that notion of identity; for any other proper explication of identity, would be as ſubſervient to it, as this, and the Arguments would retain their full force; for the ſubſtance of Bread, can in no proper ſenſe, be ſaid to be identified with the Body of *Chriſt.*

Secondly, I Anſwer, directly to the Objection: And deny, that any prejudice would hence acrew to the Predicables: for this Propoſition, *Homo eſt Animal,* contains two Metaphyſical concreats, *videlicet, Homo,* and *Animal*; and it muſt be thus reſolved, *Habens Humanitatem eſt habens Animalitatem,* where the *rectum* of the prædicate, is identified with the *rectum* of the ſubject, for it is the ſame *habens* in both caſes. As in Phyſical concrets; *Album eſt frigidum*; which is thus reſolved, *Habens albedinem eſt habens frigiditatem.* Where the *habens,* which is the *rectum* of the ſubject, hath *omnia & ſola illa,* which are contained in

the *rectum* of the Predicate; and ſo of all others of the like nature. That Propoſition, *Verbum factum eſt caro*, is much of the ſame nature; for the Subject *Verbum*, and the Predicate *factum caro*, both ſignifie *in recto*, the Divine Hypoſtaſis, whoſe perfect identity renders the Propoſition true. But ſuch Propoſitions, as enunciate a Phyſical Abſtract of its concrete; as this, *Album eſt frigiditas*, &c. ſuch acts, are all falſe, for want of identity. But this Diſcourſe is purely Logical, and therefore I leave it.

The Third Objection: If one ſhould preſent another, with a Box of Jewels, ſaying, *This I give you:* the word *this*, ſignifies that which is in the Box, but expreſſeth it not; ſo that the Propoſition renders this ſenſe, *That which is in this Box I give you:* So when our Redeemer ſaid, *This is my Body*, the word *this* only ſignifieth that which was preſent under that Collection of *Species*, but expreſſeth it not: as if he ſhould have ſaid, *That which is contained under theſe Species is my Body.* Where no mention is made of Bread.

I Anſwer: This is the ſame that hath been already Solved, though Propoſed in a New Dreſs: which notwithſtanding a great Divine of the Society of the *Jeſuites*, much inſiſts upon, and renders *Chriſt*'s Propoſition thus, *Contentum ſub his ſpeciebus eſt corpus meum.* My Anſwer is, That whatſoever was contained under the *Species* of Bread then preſent, when the word *Hoc* was pronounced, was the true Object thereof; but nothing but the ſubſtance of Bread, was then contained under the Species of Bread, then preſent; *ergo*, nothing but the ſubſtance of Bread was the true Object thereof. For in order to the aſſigning the true Object to that Particle *Hoc*, it is not pertinent to examine, whether that Object be explicitly and diſtinctly, or only implicitly and obſcurely ſignified.

Edw. Worſley in Manuſcript.

The Fourth Objection: There are other concurring teſtimonies of our Saviour in Scripture, beſides that already mentioned, which ſufficiently prove *Tranſubſtantiation*; as, *The Bread that I will give you is my fleſh*; *Except you eate the fleſh of the Son of Man*, &c.

&c. all which ſignifie the Fleſh of *Chriſt* to be given in the Sacrament, the Bread being deſtroyed.

I Anſwer. The firſt Text ſignifieth, in a literal ſenſe, that Bread is the Fleſh of *Chriſt*, which is already proved impoſſible; the ſecond makes no mention of the Bread, but only of the Fleſh of *Chriſt*, which concerns the Real Preſence, but not *Tranſubſtantiation*; which is the only queſtion now in hand.

And to avoid unneceſſary Repetitions, I Averre, That no one Text of Scripture doth declare any Converſion, or Commutation of the Bread into the Body of *Chriſt*; which is the main thing to be proved, in order to *Tranſubſtantiation*, for this cannot ſubſiſt without ſuch a Converſion.

The Fifth Objection: The Divine Power of *Chriſt* hath converted Water into Wine; hath fed Five Thouſand with five Loaves and two Fiſhes: where he either Converted the Ayre into Bread and Fiſh, or elſe replicated the Loaves and Fiſhes, and ſo put them in ſeveral places at once.

And

And by the Power of God's Omnipotence, *Aaron*'s Rod was turned into a Serpent: Why then ſhould we refuſe our Aſſent to his turning Bread into his Body?

The Anſwer: We do not at all Queſtion the Power of the Omnipotent, who can work greater Wonders then theſe; nay, the Creation of this Globe of the Univerſe, which he produced out of nothing, was a greater Proof of God's Omnipotence; but, we deny the thing of Fact; that *Chriſt* hath actually changed Bread into his Body; which we have no ground to Believe; and as our Opponents defend it, we conceive it impoſſible.

Another Objection may be taken from the Autority of the Fathers; whereof ſome ſeem to affirm, others to deny. But their Opinions make no Articles of Faith; and though we reverence their Autority, yet we deem it not expedient, in this place, to ſcan the drift of their reſpective ſayings.

Only this in General: Their uſual expreſſions of this Sacrament, are, That

That it contains the Symbole, the Figure, the Type, the Antitype, the Reſemblance, the Sign, the Image of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*; which certainly muſt ſtand in oppoſition with the Real Preſence of the thing it ſelf.

Diſpute V.

Diſpute V.

Of the Reall Preſence.

The Preface.

HAving Treated of Tranſubſtantiation, *which imports a real Converſion of the ſubſtance of Bread and Wine, into the Body and Blood of* Chriſt, *I now come to Inſtitute a Diſcourſe of the* Real Preſence. *For though a Converſion of that nature, by force of the words of Conſecration, which ſhould verifie the ſame words, in a literal ſenſe, be wholly impoſſible, as hath been proved; yet I do not deny, but that in the Treaſury of Gods Omnipotency, there is contained a Power to Conſtitute the Body of* Chriſt *Really Preſent in the Sacrament, præſcinding from the manner how it is done; which if it be by a Converſi-*

on,

on, it would invert the Order of Nature in a high degree, and multiply a prodigious number of Miracles, without neceſſity. But in this Diſcourſe I ſhall only inquire into the Matter of Fact; whether the Body of Chriſt *be* Really Preſent *in the Euchariſt, or not, and not at all examine the manner, how it is there, and ſo proceed equally againſt* Tranſubſtantiation, Conſubſtantiation, *and* Impanation. *For I take* Companation *to be the ſame with* Conſubſtantiation. *And by the* Real Preſence, *I underſtand, a Real, Actual, and Local Exiſtence, whereby the Body of* Chriſt *is locally preſent, not only in Heaven, but alſo in the Euchariſt, the ſame time, as the Church of* Rome *Teacheth; waving any other peculiar preſence beſides this, that the Body of* Chriſt *may have in this Sacrament: for my preſent deſign, is only to examine the truth of that Aſſertion, which affirms the Body of* Chriſt, *to be Properly, Really, Phyſically, and Locally Preſent in the Euchariſt, by a Homogeneal* ubi *with the Conſecrated Hoſt, whether this* ubi *be Circumſcriptive, or Definitive.*

SECT. I.

SECT. I.

The Church of Rome's *Definitions concerning the* Real Preſence.

IN theſe later Centuries from *Chriſt*, various Queſtions, and Difficulties have been agitated, concerning the Euchariſt, wherein both contending parts might prudently have ſpared themſelves the trouble, of raiſing ſuch conteſts, no way beneficial to a Chriſtian Life, nor neceſſary to Salvation.

As *Firſt*, Whether the ſame Body of *Chriſt*, which is in Heaven, be Truely and Really, or only Virtually, and Figuratively, preſent in the Sacrament? What need ſo Hot a Debate of this Qneſtion, to perplex the Minds of the Well-meaning Vulgar? who might as ſoon obtain Heaven, by their Implicit Faith, as after ſo long a protracted Contention, with ſuch Heate and Animoſity, on both ſides, in order to the deciſi-

on

on of this Queſtion; which notwithſtanding, neither is, nor ever will be determin'd, ſo as both Parties will Acquieſce.

For, ſuppoſing the Body of *Chriſt*, to be only Virtually, and Figuratively preſent; yet, by its being there *in Virtute*, there are as many degrees of Grace, both Habitual, and Actual, produced in the Soul of the Faithful, and Worthy Receiver, as if it were Really, and Corporally preſent: there are the ſame Spiritual Benefits, and Emoluments, to advance its progreſs in Vertue, and its tendency towards Eternity, in both caſes.

For, as in *Baptiſme*, the Lotion, which is duly applyed by the Baptizer, according to *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, Sanctifies the Soul of the Baptized, expels Original Sin, and gives him a Right to the Inheritance of Glory; and yet the remote Matter ſtill remains a meer Natural Element of Water, as it was before: and the Immediate Matter, which is the Application of that Water to the Baptized, is of it ſelf a pure Natural Action: though by Vertue of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution,

Inſtitution, theſe Natural things acquire a Power, to produce ſuch Supernatural effects, as pure Nature cannot pretend to. So likewiſe in the Euchariſt, the Natural ſubſtances of Bread and Wine, have the ſame capacity, of being elevated to a Sacrament, by *Chriſt*'s Ordination, and conſequently of being inſtrumental, to produce thoſe Spiritual effects, which, by Divine Inſtitution, are annexed to the due receiving of this Sacrament, as well as the Natural Element of Water; for whether the Body of *Chriſt* be really preſent or not, yet certain it is, that he is there by his Vertue, by his Divinity, and by his Omnipotency, and will as aſſuredly confer upon the worthy Receiver, thoſe Spiritual Guifts, which he hath promiſed, as if he were in verity, and reality preſent by his Body.

Notwithſtanding, the Church of *Rome* tenaciouſly aſſerts the *Real Preſence* of *Chriſt*'s Body in this Sacrament, and hath raiſed it to an Article of Divine Faith, Fulminating an *Anathema* againſt all thoſe who ſhall deny it. So the Council of *Trent*; *Si quis negaverit, in Sanctiſſimæ Euchariſtiæ Sacramento, contineri vere, realiter, & ſubſtantialiter,* *Trident. Seſſ. 13. Can. 1.*

substantialiter, corpus & sanguinem, unà cum anima, & Divinitate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum; sed dixerit tantummodò esse in eo, ut in signo, vel figura, aut virtute; Anathema sit. This definition is consonant to the Canons and Decrees of other Councils, and diverse Texts of the canon Law. As *Concil Constant. 2. Lateran. Con.* &c. *C. Panis. de consecrat. D. 2. C. Cum Marthæ de celebrat. Miss.* &c. So that they have made it an Article of Faith, and thrown their Curse upon all that shall deny it; and yet many Thousands there are, among the ignorant Vulgar, of both Sexes, who, after this definition, cannot give an account of the difference, between the Real, Virtual, and Figurative being of *Christ*'s Body in this Sacrament, and so must still have recourse to their Implicit Faith, as much as if there were no such definition. And how much this Belief of the *Real Presence*, conduceth to Salvation, I leave to the judgment of the impartial *Reader*; supposing what hath been already said.

But this is not all; for out of this decision of their Councils, there issueth another Quæry; for supposing the *Real*

Presence

Presence of *Christ*'s Body in the Eucharist, a Natural doubt ariseth. What is become of the substance of Bread that was there before? Here *Authors* are divided, into three different Classes; some place the Body of *Christ* here by *Transubstantiation*, others by *Consubstantiation*, others by *Impanation*. The first Teach, that the substancee of Bread, as well Matter as Forme, is destroyed, by a Natural Exigence of *Christ*'s Body being placed there, because two compleat Corporeal Substances, cannot be naturally, in the same place, the same time. The two last Opinions Teach, That the substance of Bread remaineth together with *Christ*'s Body, and differ only in this, That they who hold *Consubstantiation*, assert the Body of *Christ* to be with the substance of the Bread; whereas the Authors of *Impanation* Teach, The Body of *Christ* to be contained in this Sacrament invisibly, because the substance of bread, with its proper accidents, as it were, covers and veiles it so, as to render it uncapable of being perceived by any Corporeal Sense. So that the body of *Christ* being Miraculously Superinduc't, is imbib'd within the substance of the bread,

and penetrated with it, and therefore not pervious to Senſation.

In this variety of Opinions, Who ſhall be the Umpire? Certainly none more accommodated for this Function, then the great Oracle of the Univerſe, The Church of *Rome*, whoſe grand Prerogative of Infallibility, will take off all ambiguity of the truth of her deciſions. Thus then ſpeaks the Council of *Trent*. *Quoniam autem Chriſtus Redemptor noſter, corpus ſuum, id quod ſub ſpecie panis offerebat, verè eſſe dixit; ideo perſuaſum ſemper in Eccleſia Dei fuit, idque nunc denuo ſancta hæc Synodus declarat, per conſecrationem panis & vini, converſionem fieri totius ſubſtantiæ panis, in ſubſtantiam corporis Chriſti Domini noſtri, & totius ſubſtantiæ vini in ſubſtantiam ſanguinis ejus; quæ converſio convenienter & propriè a Sancta Catholica Eccleſia, Tranſubſtantiatio eſt appellata.* The ſame is contained in other Councils and Texts of the Common Law, as *Concil Rom. 6. Concil Lateran. 2. In cap. Qui manducant de conſecrat. diſt. 2. cap. Iteratur. Cap. ſemel Chriſtus. cap. ſingulis,*

with

with other Texts above cited for the *Real Preſence.*

And this definition of the Council, is backt by a ſevere Canon, able to ſtrike terror into the disbelievers. The Canon runs thus, *Si quis dixerit in Sacroſancto Euchariſtiæ Sacramento remanere ſubſtantiam panis & vini unà cum corpore & ſanguine Domini Noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, negaveritque mirabilem illam, & ſingularem converſionem totius ſubſtantiæ panis in corpus, & totius ſubſtantiæ vini, in ſanguinem, manentibus duntaxat ſpeciebus panis & vini; quam quidem converſionem Catholica Eccleſia optiſſimè Tranſubſtantiationem appellat; Anathema ſit:* Here is a heavy Curſe fulminated againſt all thoſe that ſhall deny any part of this Canon, which not only condemns the two former Opinions, but is likewiſe extended to all thoſe that deny the *Real Preſence.* And to make it the more plauſible, the Pens of their beſt Divines are induſtriouſly imployed, to work their Adherents, and Proſelites, into the Belief of it. So *Valerius Reginaldus in parte fori pœnit. L. 29. n. 36. Vaſq; 3 Part. To. 3. D. 180 nu. 108. & alibi. Leſaſn. tract. de Euch. C. 6. Concil. 2. 3. & paſſim*

alii. For is it hereby made an Article of Divine Faith, and all are enjoyn'd to believe it as ſuch, under the moſt rigorous Commination of being Condemned to the Eternal Flames of Hell Fire, if they call in queſtion this Decree, and Canon of the Council, or any part thereof.

SECT. II.

SECT. II.

Other Subtilties ariſing from the former Deciſions not fully determin'd.

OTher Difficulties of like nature are frequently diſcuſſed by their Divines, but not yet determin'd by the Church; as Firſt, By what means the Body of *Chriſt* is made Corporeally preſent in the *Euchariſt*? Whether by a new production, really diſtinct from that which conſerves his Sacred Body in Heaven; or elſe by a new ubication, which they call adduction? if the firſt, then the Body and Soul of *Chriſt* muſt be created anew, and the Natural and Hypoſtatical Unions muſt terminate new eductive actions, really diſtinct from thoſe whereby they exiſt in Heaven. I remember to have Read a Book Written by one *Tho. Barton*, alias *Anderton*, an *Engliſh Jeſuite*, wherein he earneſtly contends to eſtabliſh this Opinion; but I alſo heard others of the ſame Order, to object againſt him,

That according to his Opinion, the Divine Word, would be as often Incarnate again, as there ſhould be Hoſts Conſecrated; for every Conſecration argues a new Incarnation, becauſe, though the Hypoſtatical Union be ſtill the ſame, yet the action which produceth it, is wholly new. So that the common Opinion of their Divines, is, That all the parts of *Chriſt* in the *Euchariſt* acquire only new *ubies*, or ubications, whereby the Body, the Soul, *&c.* together with their reſpective actions (the very ſame that are in Heaven) are rendred preſent in the Sacrament, and without leaving their Station in Heaven, they do by every Conſecration acquire a new place, and whereas they exiſted but in one place before, they now exiſt in two places at the ſame time.

Hence ariſeth a Second Difficulty relating to the nature of this *ubi*, whereby the Body of *Chriſt* is exiſtent under the *Species* of bread; and the Queſtion is, Whether it be *ubi circumſcriptivum*, or *ubi definitivum*? that is, Whether the body of *Chriſt* exiſt in the *Euchariſt*, as it doth in Heaven, having all its parts duly ordered and collocated

ted in their diſtinct ſtations, with their natural diſtances, conjunctions, and contiguities to each other, as human bodies are here framed, ſo as that the Hand imployes one part of the ſpace, the Foot another part, the Head another, *&c.* or elſe whether the whole body be in the whole ſpace of the Hoſt, and the ſame whole body in every diſtinct part and particle of the Hoſt, as a reaſonable Soul is wholly in every part of a Human body: if ſo, then the Body of *Chriſt*, in the Sacrament, hath a definitive ubication, whereby all its parts are penetrated, and ſo involved and implicated within each other, that an Angel cannot cull out a particle of the Hoſt, how ſmall ſoever it be, and that no ſenſe can perceive it, but it contains all *Chriſt*. And this Opinion they incline to.

A Third Queſtion occurreth: How long the Body of *Chriſt*, together with the Soul, the Divinity, *&c.* remain in the Conſecrated Hoſt? There are various Anſwers to this Queſtion; but the common gives this Rule, That as long as the natural *Species* of bread remains in the Hoſt, ſo long, and no longer

the

the Body of *Chriſt* is there preſent; ſo that what alteration ſoever is made in the Hoſt, by natural cauſes, if the diſpoſition ſuffer not ſo much change, as would render it uncapable to ſuſtain the ſubſtantial forme of bread, ſo long the Body of *Chriſt* remains there; but when by contrary Agents, the laſt diſpoſition of the forme of bread is expel'd, then the Body of *Chriſt* withdraws, and relinquiſheth its *ubi*, not by a local motion, but by a meer deſtruction of that ubication, without acquiring any new one, but is reduced to his former ubication, without paſſing from Earth to Heaven. And though before the deſtruction of the accidents of bread, the Body of *Chriſt* was exiſtent in Heaven, and here on Earth, the ſame time, yet after that deſtruction, it exiſts only in Heaven, and yet never tended, by a local and ſucceſſive motion, from Earth towards Heaven; nor ever penetrated, the Air, nor the Heavens, to obtain his place in the Emperial Heaven, becauſe it had that place before. This is the ſum of their Doctrine.

Theſe

Theſe Three Difficulties, though much agitated by their Divines, yet are not fully determined by their Church. Only the Council of *Trent* touches upon the Second, and Third, but leaves the Firſt to the litigation of the Schoolmen. Of the Second, it ſaith, *Si quis negaverit in venerabili Sacramento Euchariſtiæ ſub unaquaque ſpecie & ſub ſingulis cujusque ſpeciei partibus, ſeparatione facta, totum Chriſtum contineri, Anathema ſit.* If any one ſhall deny in the venerable Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, all *Chriſt* to be contained under each Kind, and under every part of each Kind, after Separation, let him be Accurſed. The ſame is declared, *Seſs.* 23. *Cap.* 3. *&* *Seſs.* 21. *Cap.* 3. which is conformable to the Council of *Florence*, *In Decreto Eugenii ad Armenios*; yet none of theſe places define the manner how *Chriſt*'s Body exiſts in this Sacrament, whether definitively, or Circumſpectively, but only aſſert all *Chriſt* to be in each part. *Trid. Con. Seſs.* 23. *Can.* 3.

As to the Third, The Council of *Trent* decrees the Body of *Chriſt* to be preſent, immediately after Conſecration,

on, but reſolves nothing, how long it continues there; for thus ſaith the Council, *Si quis dixerit peracta conſecratione in admirabili Euchariſtiæ Sacramento, non eſſe corpus, & ſanguinem Domini Noſtri Jeſus Chriſti; ſed tantum in uſu, dum ſumitur, non autem ante, vel poſt, & in hoſtiis, ſeu particulis conſecratis, quæ poſt Communionem reſervantur, vel ſuperſunt, non remanere verum corpus Domini, Anathema ſit.* If any one ſhall ſay, That after Conſecration, in the Admirable Sacrament of the Euchariſt, the Body and Blood of our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt* is not there, but only in practice, when it is received, yet not before, nor after; and that in the Hoſts, or Particles, that are Conſecrated, which after Communion are reſerved, or left, the true Body of *Chriſt* doth not remain, let him be Accurſed. This declares when the Body of *Chriſt* begins to be preſent in the Sacrament, but determines nothing, how long it remains there. But ſince there is no more neceſſity of defining the *Real Preſence*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, &c. then of determining thoſe difficulties here propoſed; we may groundedly expect in the next general Council a full

Trid. Seſs. 33. Can. 4.

full deciſion of theſe nice Queſtions, by new Canons, and Decrees, and new Articles of Faith, to be framed for the reſolution of theſe and the like doubts.

SECT. III.

SECT. III.

The Inutility of Multiplying Definitions of this nature.

AND now, if ſome impartial, and unbyaſſed Judge, were to deliver his Opinion of theſe, and the like proceedings, of the Church of *Rome*, I would propoſe to his Conſideration,

Firſt, What Grounds, or Footſteps can be found in Scripture; in the Practiſe, or Doctrine of *Chriſt*, or his *Apoſtles*, or in all the Tranſactions of *Antiquity*, or the *Primitive Church*, for ſo Rigorous, and Comminatorious deciſion of ſuch ſubtile and nice Points, under ſo great a Penalty? and I am ſure none can be found.

Secondly, Caſt a glance upon the effects of theſe new-framed Articles of Faith. What Benefit, or Emolument, doth accrew to Chriſtianity by them?

Do

Do the Graces of *Chriſt*, flow from the Sacraments, more plentifully, by vertue of thoſe Definitions then they did before? This cannot be alleged; for the meaſure of Grace, was taxed and determined by *Chriſt*, in his Original Inſtitution, with reference to the diſpoſition of the receiver. Do they conduce to the better inſtitution of a Chriſtian Life? Do the Faithful the more adhere to the due obſervance of Gods Law? Do they promote Vertue and Good Life? Do they check the illegal progreſs of the Licentious? Do they cry down Vice, and Wickedneſs? Do they add any new Motives to abandon the Old Man, and ſhun Senſuality? Do they excite to the regulating our Actions, by the Conduct of a juſt Syndereſis, inſtructed with true Reaſon, and to reject the ſuggeſtion of ſenſe? not the leaſt of theſe products do iſſue from them.

Nay, on the contrary, Do they not add more load to the Conſciences of the Faithful? who are bound to Believe what they comprehend not. Do they not enthrall and enſlave their Souls to be liable to the Belief of ſuch

a long Catalogue of nicities, or elſe be damned? What a dreadful thing it is, to implicate Mens Minds, and Conſciences into ſuch an unextricable labyrinth of ſollicitude, anxiety, and confuſion, when they ſhall conſider, that of ſo many definitions, if they disbelieve but one, though they believe all the reſt; nothing remains for them, but the eternal flames of Hell Fire? And yet they are wholly ignorant what it is they ought to believe, for you were as good endeavor to waſh a Blackamore white, as to go about to make the common vulgar of both Sexes capable of the true meaning of thoſe points, which are ſo remote from ſenſe.

And, How can they exerciſe themſelves in Vertue, while ſuch anxious ſcruples, and confuſion, clowds their underſtanding, and caſts a damp upon all their vital faculties? Nay, this hath an immediate tendency to deſpair, for when they conſider themſelves uncapable of complying with ſuch a Maſs of Implex Articles of Faith, and conſidering their own imbecility, they will be apt to conceive, that they are loſt, and that Eternity of Bliſs is out of their reach,

reach; for, *qui erraverit in uno factus eſt omnium reus:* he that errs in one, is made guilty of all; and hence they connaturally fall into deſperation.

Beſides, What more hinders the Propagation of the *Goſpel*, then ſuch a multiplicity of Tenets, pretended neceſſary to Salvation, and yet ſo full of arduity, and ſo repugnant to the common courſe of Nature, which are apt to ſtartle the moſt credulous? Who would imbrace Chriſtianity, if ſuch a bundle of incredible Myſteries were candidly propoſed to them, as all neceſſary to Salvation? which are ſo deſtructive of the Laws of Nature; and no Proofes of any of them, but only becauſe the Church of *Rome* hath defined them. Few or none would deny their Reaſon, and yield a blind conformity to ſuch, and ſo many irregular Pardons, as they ought to believe.

Theſe, and many other ſuch inconveniences, are the products of multiplying ſo many new Articles of Faith, theſe are the fatal conſequences that thence enſue. And if you conſult your Reaſon, to ſuggeſt to you, what benefit is hence expected, or what Motives might

induce them, to impoſe ſo hard a taske upon the Believers: I know none, but a ſtrong propenſion in the Authors, to carry all things on, with a ſtrong hand, to make their Empire known, and to Lord it over the Flock of *Chriſt*.

But it may be Objected, That the Illiterate ſhall not need to perplex themſelves, for they have a ſure refuge to their Implicite Faith, by believing what the Church believeth.

Firſt, I Anſwer, That this is a very deordinate and irregular point of Doctrine, to Teach them to regulate their Implicite Faith by the Belief of the Church of *Rome*; as if this were a ſurer Rule to walk by, then the Doctrine, the Practice, the Ordination, and Inſtitution of *Chriſt* himſelf. How hot doth this ſmell of Blaſphemy? to put ignorant Souls upon ſuch a prepoſterous way of Faith, as to prefer the Belief of the Church of *Rome*, before the Inſtitution of *Chriſt*, whereby the Faith of the Church ought to be originally regulated.

Secondly,

Secondly, I Answer, If any Implicite Faith be sufficient after the definition, then the explicite declaration of so many Articles availeth nothing; for the very same Implicite Faith, that was sufficient before the definition, is sufficient after; then the Councils labor in vain, or rather not in vain; for though their numerous definitions, produce no good effect, yet they have an ample power in producing bad effects, as hath been declared. And thus far I go with them, that in matters of Divine Faith, an implicite in most cases, is sufficient to Salvation, provided it have a reference to that never erring Rule of *Christ*'s Doctrine and Institution; and, What *Romanist* dares deny this? For, I confidently assert, That an Implicite Faith, regulated by the belief of the Church of *Rome*, is not sufficient to Salvation; for this Church hath erred, and may erre again, as is in this *Treatise* sufficiently declared, and proved.

But to shew yet more groundedly, That the multiplying of so many Articles of Faith, are wholly useless, and pernicious; let any rational person

conſider, what ſtrange wonders the Supreme Creator of all things hath wrought, to bring about this great Work of Mans Redemption. The Divine Word took Humane Nature upon him, God became Man, and, a Man, ſuffer'd great indignities, and oppoſition, and at laſt ſuffer'd death upon a Croſs. What was all this for but in order to the Redemption of Mankind. And after all this, he ſettled his Church, Inſtituted Sacraments and Ordained what he deemed neceſſary, to accompliſh his final end. Is it then credible, that having accompliſht all other means neceſſary to this end, he ſhould at laſt be deficient in the application of thoſe means which would render them all uſeleſs? Had he no care of his Church, no Providence for it, in future Ages?

What need is there then of ſo many new Articles of Faith? *Chriſt* had a perfect proſpect, and a full comprehenſion of his Church, and all circumſtances belonging to it, for all particular times, and ages; and wanted no power to provide for it in the beſt manner; How then is it poſſible, that

any
conc
nipo
Prov
in a
houl
Rede
fail i
of h
derin
vide
have
when
An
houl
of ſo
or ſu
their
about
Men
of ou
ſtianit
Rede
Wh
on to
Chriſt
fects,
an

any perſon, indued with Reaſon, can conceive, that this Omniſcient, Omnipotent, and Infinitely Wiſe, and Provident God, ſhould be deficient, in a work of this Nature? that he ſhould leave this great work of our Redemption imperfect, that he ſhould fail in the compleat accompliſhment of his Maſter-piece? eſpecially conſidering, that he could with eaſe provide *tunc pro nunc*, he could then have provided for all future events, whenſoever they ſhould happen.

And it is as impoſſible, that he ſhould leave any defects in a deſign of ſo high a nature, to be corrected, or ſupplyed by meer Men, that carry their human frailty and imperfections about them; for by this means, ſuch Men would be concauſes in the work of our Redemption; and yet Chriſtianity never yet acknowledged any Redeemer but one.

Wherefore, it is a high preſumption to attempt to compleat, or perfect *Chriſt*'s work, or to ſupply the defects, which we falſely ſuppoſe he

hath left in it. Nothing is more repugnant to Reason, and nothing more derogates from the infinite Attributes, and high Prerogatives of our Great Redeemer.

Whence I conclude with this Dilemma: Either *Christ* instituted all things necessary to Salvation, or he did not. If not, What then became of all the Primitive Christians, for Eight Hundred years together after *Christ?* for, in their time, none of those new Doctrines, which are now defined, were yet started.

Would *Christ* permit so many Millions, that were all Members of his Church, to perish, for want of necessary means to Salvation? This would reflect upon the Author of Life, and make him a Deluder.

They must therefore acknowledge, That *Christ* did Institute in his Church all things necessary to Salvation. If so, Then what necessity is there of so many new definitions? which only serve to pester and incumber Mens Minds;

Minds; becauſe, forſooth, Eternal Damnation muſt be the reward of them, that deny any one of them, yea, or ſo much as doubt of the Truth of any them.

SECT. IV.

The Objections ſolved.

THE Firſt Objection: According to the Principles of this Diſcourſe, all Councils would be uſeleſs, or rather pernicious; for, the main deſign of Councils is, to decide ſuch doubts, as are promiſcuouſly diſcuſſed among the multitude, of whom (without the Autority of a Council) none have power to give a final determination; and therefore Councils have been always in uſe: there was a Council in the Apoſtles time; there were ſeveral Councils in the *Primitive Church*. So that this Doctrine wholly ſwerves from Reaſon and Antiquity.

The Firſt Anſwer: I am no Enemy of Councils, but on the contrary, conceive them of great uſe, and ſometimes neceſſary for the right Adminiſtration of the Church; for certainly many great and good effects depend upon them,

them, when they take their meaſures right, and truly conceive how far the limits of their power and autority extend. But if Councils tranſgreſs their bounds, and ſubmit *Chriſt*'s Actions to their ſcrutiny, and therein preſume to add or diminiſh, to alter or change, to correct or amend, any of *Chriſt*'s Ordinances or Inſtitutions, and ſo intrench upon *jus Divinum*, which is above their ſphere; and in effect to cry out, *in cœlum conſcendam, ſimilis ero Altiſſimo:* this is a pernicious abuſe of their autority; wherefore,

The Second Anſwer is; That when Vertue begins to decline, and Vice to abound; when the Clergy grows diſſolute, and the Laity ſtubborn and refractory againſt their Spiritual Leaders, and Paſtors; when the Doctrine and Practice of *Chriſt*, and the Primitive Chriſtians, is not fully upheld in its Original Purity, but begins to be oftuſcated, and to loſe its efficacy, by Innovations, and in many other caſes of like nature, then are Councils both profitable and neceſſary, as a Phyſitian is to a ſick Patient; then ought they, by their opportune Remedies, to ſalve the

the Sores, to make up the breaches, to reforme the abuſes, and to redintegrate the whole body of the Church, and purge the Wheate, from the Cockle, and Darnel, which by the depraved will of Man, and the ſuggeſtion of Sathan, began to take root.

But if Councils ſhould ſpend their endeavors, in debating certain abſtruſe, and hidden Myſteries, and frame Articles of Divine Faith upon them, without any warrant in Scripture, or Antiquity; nay, againſt the Original Belief of the Church; and by their annexed Anathema's drive Men to confuſion, and deſperation, and yet reap no benefit thereby; (for it neither promotes Vertue, nor curbs Vice, nor any way conduceth to the inſtitution of a Moral and Chriſtian Life; but on the contrary it puts Mens Conſciences upon the Rack, it diſturbs the peace and quiet of their Minds, it hinders their due application to Vertue and Morality, it perplexes their Souls with Scruples, and diſpoſeth them to deſpair. In this caſe, I appeal to the Judgment of the whole World, Whether the multiplying

ing of ſuch deciſions, be not fruitleſs and pernicious?

To what is added in the Objection, I grant, that Councils have been always in uſe, not to decide ſuch ſpeculative points of Divinity, and reduce them to Articles of Faith, but to ſolve practical doubts, which may ariſe among the vulgar, concerning their practiſe, and manners, *&c.* which may be inſtrumental to facilitate their progreſs towards Heaven; but as for Divine Faith, it ought to be ſaid to them as St. *Paul* ſaid to the *Galatians*, That if an Angel ſhould come from Heaven, and Teach them otherwiſe then they had been Taught, by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, they ought not to believe him, but *let him be Accurſed*, ſaith the Apoſtle, *Gal.* 1. 8, 9.

The Second Objection: We are Taught by experience, that ſeveral *Hereſiarchs* have often attempted to make a breach in the Church, by their new Heterodox Doctrine; and the moſt efficacious remedy in the Church to prevent ſuch inconveniences, is to Ana-

Anathematize the Authors, and condemn their Errors, as Heretical, which hath been alwayes practiſed in the Church with good ſucceſs, for the extirpating of Hereſie, and eſtabliſhing Orthodox Doctrine.

To this Objection I Anſwer, *Firſt*, That when the Definitions of Councils are grounded in Scripture, in the Doctrine and Practiſe of *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles*, or otherwiſe by true Revelations made manifeſt, to be of Divine Autority, ſuch definitions are warrantable, and uſeful to extinguiſh Hereſie; but nothing of all this will quadrate with the forecited definitions, of the Church of *Rome*; which are no way proved by Autority, nor Reaſon; nay, rather they are repugnant to both, yet are obtruded to the Credulous Believers, under a *Curſe*, to be by them received, by a blind aſſent, without examining the truth of them.

Secondly, I Anſwer, That the moſt appoſite and efficacious way to ſuppreſs Hereſie, is to evince the Error of

of it, by ſolid and convincing Arguments, drawn from Divine Autority, or evident Principles of Reaſon.

Theſe are the Armes with which the Antient Fathers wag'd War againſt the reſpective Hereſies of their times: So St. *Ambroſe* with his Preaching, and ſolid Principles, drew the great St. *Auguſtine* from his Hereſie, to imbrace the Orthodox Doctrine of *Chriſtianity*; and the ſame *Auguſtine* being fully convinced thereof, with no leſs induſtry and zeal, then learning, efficaciouſly refelled the Errors of the *Manichæans*, the *Pellagians*, the *Maſſilienſes*, the *Donatiſts*, &c. he alledged not the Autority of Councils, but convinced the Broachers, and Abetters of thoſe Errors, with ſolid Arguments, whereby he detected the Fallacy of their irregular Tenets: And ſo by Divine Autority, and ſtrength of Reaſon, refelled their illegal Aſſertions.

The

The Reason of this proceeding is manifest; for the first Authors of such Erroneous Doctrines, and they who greedily give their assent to them, make it their business to maintain them against all opposition, and glory in their undertakings, hugging their Errors, as the happy products of their own understanding, whence they so tenaciously adhere to them, that no Curse, nor Censure, can make any impression upon them.

If you cite the Definitions of Councils against them, they alledge their Reasons against you, and Challenge you to Solve them.

How earnestly did *Nestorius* insist, upon the Force of his Argument, to prove two Persons in *Christ?* And the whole stress of his Proofe he reduced to this one *Sillogisme:*

Omnis Natura Rationalis Completa est Persona; sed in Christo sunt duæ Rationales Naturæ completæ; ergo duæ Personæ.

In

In *Engliſh* thus:

All Compleat Rational Natures are Perſons; but, in *Chriſt*, there are two compleat Rational Natures; *ergo*, in *Chriſt* there are two Perſons.

With this *Argument Neſtorius* perplext the *Fathers*, whereof none durſt deny either of the Premiſes, and yet the Concluſion was Erroneous. And certainly *Neſtorius* would have ſlighted any definition of a Council, againſt his Aſſertion, without ſolving his Argument.

Wherefore, the moſt efficacious way to Refute an Heretick, is to Inſtruct his Reaſon, and Convince his Judgment, that his Principles are Erroneous; to this end Arguments are to be drawn from Scripture and Divine Autority, ſeconded by cleer and evident Reaſon, and from theſe two Premiſes you may infer a concluſion contradictory to the Error.

And hereby you encreaſe the Authors Adheſion to his Error: for there

there are none ſo obſtinate as to deny that which is eſtabliſht by known Divine Autority, and Evident Reaſon.

SECT. V.

SECT. V.

When, and from whom this Doctrine of the Real Preſence *took its firſt riſe?*

ALl Dogmatical Aſſertions, which are pretended to be matters of Divine Faith, if they be ſo, its rigorouſly neceſſary that they be backt by Divine Autority, and therefore muſt be traced immediately from *Chriſt* himſelf; or elſe atteſted by thoſe Hagyographers, the old *Prophets*, *Apoſtles*,&c. who were immediately inſpired by the *Holy Ghoſt*, and ſo could not erre; by whoſe Mediation it muſt *ultimate* be reſolved into Divine Autority.

The reaſon hereof is, becauſe all acts of Divine Faith conſiſt eſſentially of two parts; the Material and the Formal Object; the Material Object is the thing believed: the Formal Object, is *dictio Dei*, Gods ſaying it, which is the only motive that induceth us to believe it, as Divine Faith. And herein Faith differs from Science, and

Opinion, becauſe Science, though inveſted with certainty, yet derives it from the evidence of Human Reaſon, which is inductive to the aſſent. Opinion hath neither certainty, nor evidence, but a meer probability, grounded on a weak foundation of Reaſon; *cum formidine partis oppoſitæ*; it is always accompanyed with an ambiguity, either formal, or virtual, that the contrary may be true: But Faith, if it be Divine, relyes upon Divine Autority; if Human, on Human Autority. For inſtance; we believe that the Divine Word is Incarnate, becauſe God hath aſſured it; this is an act of Divine Faith, whoſe material Object, is the Incarnation of the Divine Word. The formal Object, is Gods aſſerting of it.

Whence it enſues, that though Faith have a greater certainty then Science, yet it is deſtitute of Evidence, as well *in atteſtato*, as *in atteſtante*, that is, can neither demonſtrate by Human Reaſon, the Revelation it ſelf, nor the Myſtery revealed.

We all agree, that thoſe words, *Hoc eſt corpus meum*, were ſpoken by *Chriſt* himſelf: But we differ in giving the

the true ſenſe and meaning of them. The ſureſt Rule that may guide us herein, is to conſult the Belief of the Primitive Church, they certainly received from the *Apoſtles* the true Interpretation of them. For it would derogate from *Chriſt*'s goodneſs, and providence, to imprint an erroneous belief, upon the firſt Profeſſors of *Chriſtianity*. What then remains? but that we conſult Antiquity, and inquire what their beliefe was of this Myſtery. And when this appears, it would be a vain attempt of any one, after a long continued ſeries of Centuries, to ſtart a new Interpretation of thoſe words, for that muſt needs be an Erroneous Innovation, and Adulterated Doctrine, as repugnant to the general belief of all Chriſtians from *Chriſt*'s time.

I ſhould ſwerve from my intended brevity, ſhould I here cite the ſeveral Texts of the antient Fathers, and Doctors of the Church, in oppoſition to the *Real Preſence*; for, ſpeaking of the *Euchariſt*, they frequently call it the Sacrement of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*; and St. *Auguſtine* tells us, That a Sacrament ſignifies a Sacred Sign, which cannot be the thing ſignified. They *Aug. de Civit. Dei L. 10. C. 5.*

alſo call it the Reſemblance, the Similitude, the Type, the Antitype; the Symbole, the Sign, the Image, the Figure of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, and conſequently not the Body it ſelf.

Conſonant to theſe expreſſions of the Fathers, was the Univerſal Belief of the Church, none poſitively affirming for above 800 years after *Chriſt*, that the Body of our Saviour was really contained in the Sacrament; Though in the year 637, A Monk of *Mount Sinai*, one *Anaſtaſius*, among other Contemplations which he had in his Cell, would needs diſapprove of the former way of ſpeaking, which had been ever uſed till his time, and ſo rejected the expreſſion of *Figure*, and *Antitype*; but uſed no attempt to ſettle any point of Doctrine, repugnant to the belief of Antiquity.

Yet, what *Anaſtaſius* began, by way of altering the Tearms, another Monk of *Corbie* in *France*, one *Paſchaſius Ratbert*, compleating by his Doctrine, Taught, That the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, were truly and really preſent in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, which he

he declares in his *Treatiſe* of the Body and Blood of our *Saviour*, which he Compoſed in the Ninth Century after *Chriſt*, in the year 818. And for this we have *Bellarmines* own Teſtimony, who acknowledgeth, that *Paſchaſius* was the firſt Author that ever Wrote a ſerious Treatiſe of the Truth of the Body and Blood of our *Saviour* in the *Euchariſt*. *Bellarm. de Script. Eccleſ.*

This Doctrine being then new, (never any before attempting to aſſert it by any ſet *Treatiſe*) it found great oppoſition; ſo that moſt of the Learneded Men in thoſe times, employed their endeavors, ſeverally, to oppoſe it, and cry it down; which *Paſchaſius* himſelf acknowledgeth; for being moved by his intimate Friend *Frudegard*, about this Doctrine; he Anſwers him; You queſtion me about a difficulty, whereof many People do doubt (to wit, of the *Real Preſence*) ſo in his Letter to *Frudegard*. And in his *Commentary* upon the 26th of St. *Mark*, he ſays, I have Treated of theſe Myſteries more amply and expreſly, becauſe I have been informed that I have been Cenſured by many; as if in the Book which I Wrote of the Sacrament, and *Paſchaſius Epiſt ad Frudegard. Pag.* 623. *Idem. in* 26 *Matth. L.* 12. *pag.* 1094.

Publiſhed, I had attributed to the words of *Chriſt*, more then the truth of the words would permit.

This being a thing ſo well known in Hiſtory, I ſhall not here inlarge upon it; but only reflect upon the Doctrine of one of our own Nation, which is venerable *Bede*, who, in ſeveral places of his Works, declares his Opinion againſt the *Real Preſence*; for he tells us, That our Saviour hath given us the Sacrament of his Body and Blood in the Figure of Bread and Wine. And that our Saviour gave to his Diſciples, in the Laſt Supper, the Figure of his Body and Blood. That the Creatures of Bread and Wine paſs into the Sacrament of his Body and Blood, by the ineffable Sactification of the *Holy Ghoſt*. That our Saviour changed the Sacrifices of the *Legalia* into the Sacrifice of Bread and Wine. And that in lieu of celebrating the Paſſion of our Saviour in the Fleſh and the Blood of Victims, as the Antients did, we celebrate it in the Oblation of Bread and Wine.

Bede in Luc. C. 22. Idem in Pſ. 3. Idem hom. de Sanc. in Epiph. Idem. in Pſ. 133. To. 8. Idem de Tabern. L. 2. C. 2. & alibi.

Theſe, and the like expreſſions, (which are frequent in the Works of this Author) do manifeſtly declare, that

that in thoſe times, none held the *Real Preſence*, but all believed the *Euchariſt* to be a Figure, or a Sacrament, (that is, a Sign) of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*.

Hence there aroſe in the Church a high debate about this new Doctrine; *Paſchaſius* got ſome Abetters of his Opinion; but the greateſt number, and the moſt conſiderable, vehemently oppoſed it, as a Novelty; others ſtood indifferent, expecting the iſſue; others again held a third Opinion, which, in ſubſtance, was *Conſubſtantiation*; for they Aſſerted, The Body of *Chriſt* in the *Euchariſt*, to be united to the ſubſtance of Bread. The conteſt about theſe ſeveral Opinions grew fervent, ſome adhering to the one part, others to the other: and this mutual Conteſt laſted all the Ninth Century. Whereupon that Great Emperor *Charles*, Surnamed *the Balde*, who was then Emperor of *Germany*, and King of *France*, finding his Subjects diſſected into oppoſite Parties, and contending againſt each other, with ſo much rancor and animoſity, reſolved to Conſult the Learneſt Men he had in his Dominions, upon the Queſtion, which was

the ground of the debate. Purſuant to this Reſolution, he calls to him one *John Scot*, whoſe right Name was *Erigene*, by Nation an *Iriſh-man*, or a *Scotch-man*, I am not certain which; This was a perſon of profound Learning, and eminent Vertue, and therefore highly eſteemed by the Emperor, and was vulgarly called, The *Holy Philoſopher*. Another, which the Emperor deſigned for his intended purpoſe, was one *Bertram*, but, by the Writers of his time, was called *Retram*, which was his true Name. He was a Monk and Prieſt of the Church of *Rome*, of the Monaſtery of *Corbie*; and afterwards, for his Fame, and rare Parts, was created Abbot of *Orbais*, who Wrote ſeveral Books; and among others, one of *Predeſtination*, againſt *Paſchaſius*, whom he Learnedly impugnes, and cenſures him of Hereſie. He was of the moſt eminent repute of his time. He was a great Opponent of all Novelty, and Innovation, and, for his Merits, very dear to the Emperor.

Theſe then were the Perſons which the Emperor conſulted, and required them, to give him in Writing, the True Senſe of the *Church*, concerning the Body of

of *Chriſt* in the *Euchariſt*, Whether it were contained in the Sacrament, in Verity and Reality, or only in Vertue and Figure? as alſo, whether it were the ſame Body of *Chriſt* that was born of the *Virgin Mary*, Suffered upon the Croſs, Roſe from the Dead, *&c.* that we receive in the Sacrament; for, to both Queſtions, *Paſchaſius* Anſwers, That it was the ſame Body preſent in the *Euchariſt* in Verity, and Reality, and not only in Vertue and Figure.

To theſe two Queſtions, the forenamed Doctors gave in their Anſwer in *Latin* to the Emperor in Writing, and their Reſolutions were contrary to the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius*, as to both Queſtions. For, to the *Firſt*, Whether that which we receive in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*, be truly and really the Body of *Chriſt*, or only a Figure and Type thereof? They both Anſwer, That the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* are contained in this Sacrament only in Figure and Virtue, and not in Reality. As to the *Second* Queſtion, Whether it be the ſame Body that was Born of the Virgin *Mary*, that ſuffered on the Croſs, that was Buried, and Roſe again, that Aſcended into Heaven? they

they Anſwer, That we Receive the Figure and Verture of that ſame Body.

And not wholly to omit the Tranſactions of theſe two Doctors. I ſhall here briefly relate ſome paſſages of each of them.

SECT. VI.

SECT. VI.

A briefe account of ſome paſſages of the life and death of John Erigène.

THis Learned Doctor, how dear ſoever he was to that Great Emperor *Charles*; yet he was ſharply cenſur'd, and ſeverely handled, by ſeveral *Authors*, and great Prelates, and eſpecially by the Council of *Valentia*, for ſome Dogmatical Points, which he deliver'd in a *Treatiſe* that he Wrote, of *Predeſtination*, and the ſtate of the future Life, as deviating from the Orthodox Principles of the Church; yet none reprehended him for his Doctrine of the *Euchariſt*. And certainly he meritted eternal renown for Tranſlating the *Hierarchy* of *Dionyſius* of *Areopagyta*, from *Greek* into *Latin*, by Command of the Emperor *Charles*, which Work added no ſmall acceſs to the Opinion formerly conceived of his zeal, and eloquence, for hence he was eſteemed a Saint, and that his Doctrine and knowledge was infus'd from Heaven.

His

His Fame daily increaſing, he was at laſt called into *England* by *Alfrede*, then King, where he was Barbarouſly Murdered by his own Diſciples, in the Monaſtery of *Malmeſbury*, in the year 883, or thereabouts, and was decently buried in that Church; but his Body was afterwards, with great Pomp, and Magnificence, tranſlated to the Cathedral, and there placed before the Altar, with this *Epitaph*, *Here lies* John *the Holy Philoſopher, who in his life time was inriched with wonderful Doctrine, and in the end had the honor to aſcend by Martyrdom to the Kingdom of* Jeſus Chriſt, *where the Saints reign eternally:* as *William* of *Malmesbury* relates. And after his deceaſe, by the Autority of the See of *Rome*, he was put into the Catalogue of Martyrs. His *Treatiſe* of the *Euchariſt* remained extant about 200 years after he Wrote it, by the Emperors Command; but about the year 1050, it was read in the Council of *Verceils*, where Pope *Leo* the Ninth preſided, and there condemned to be Burnt, as being repugnant to the Orthodox Doctrine of the *Euchariſt*, which was accordingly put in execution; and ſo this *Treatiſe* periſh'd.

Gulielm. Malmesb. L. 2. C. 5.

riſh'd. And conſequently it was often moved to have him expunged from the Catalogue of Saints, but without effect, till the time of *Baronius*, who, alledging, That he had Written againſt the *Real Preſence*, upon this account, got him excluded from that rank wherein he had been formerly placed by *Gregory* the 13th, and other Popes, as *Fuller* relates.

Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt. Angliæ, L. 2. P. 119.

SECT. VII.

SECT. VII.

Some Paſſages of the Life and Doctrine of Retram.

THis Doctor was one of the Learneſt, and of the faireſt repute of his time; and, upon this account, was choſen among the reſt, by *Charles* the Emperor, together with *John Scot*, or *Erigéne*, to give him an account, what was the true meaning of *Chriſt*'s Word's, and the true Doctrine of the Church, in relation to the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, in the Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*. By this means, to allay the heat of that turbulent Contention, and Animoſity, which had reacht the utmoſt confines of his Dominions, and diſſected his Subjects into violent Factions, occaſioned by the Writings of *Paſchaſius*, wherein he Aſſerted the *Real Preſence*.

Theſe two great Men, in Complyance to the Emperors Command, gave their

their Anſwer in two diſtinct *Treatiſes*, in *Latin*, upon this Subject, wherein they both agreed, that the true Orthodox Doctrine, never admitted of any *Real Preſence* of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, in the Sacrament, but that it was there contained Virtually, and Figuratively, by means of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, which they proved out of the Scripture, and Fathers, alleging ſeveral parallel examples out of Holy Writ: concluding, that the adverſe Opinion was a Heterodox novelty, contrary to Scripture, Fathers, and the Univerſal Belief of the Church, till that time.

Retram, when he Wrote this *Treatiſe*, was a Prieſt of the Church of *Rome*, and Monck of the Monaſtery of *Corby*: ſoon after, there aroſe great difficulties, between *Nicholas* the Firſt, then Pope, and *Photius* Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*; whereupon, Pope *Nicholas* implores the Aſſiſtance of the Biſhops of *France*, to defend the *Latin* Church againſt the *Greeks*. The Clergy of the *Gallican* Church knew not where to find a more able, and expert Champion, to carry on this great deſign, then *Bertram*, or *Retram*, and ſo unanimouſly choſe him to defend the Pope, and the *Latin*

Latin Church, againſt their Antagoniſts. *Retram* undertakes it, and diſcharges his truſt with a great deal of honor, and applauſe, and was afterwards created Abbot of *Orbais*.

But to come to his Doctrine, his *Treatiſe* of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, was providently preſerved, and at length Tranſlated into *Engliſh*, and Printed here in *England*, about a Hundred Thirty and two years ſince, in the year of our Lord 1549, whereof there have been ſeveral Editions ſince, and it was lately Printed in *France*, both in *Latin* and *French*. But now come we to give you a Specimen of the Tenets which by this Treatiſe he endeavors to eſtabliſh.

Firſt, Then, he tells us, *That the Bread, which by the Myſtery of the Prieſt, is made the Body of Chriſt, doth ſhew one thing to the External Senſes, and another thing ſoundeth inwardly to the Mind of Faith. Outwardly the Bread remaineth as it was before*, &c. and then he adds of the VVine; *The Wine alſo, which by the Conſecration of the Prieſt, is made the Sacrament of the Blood of Chriſt*, &c. *What other thing is ſuperficially*

cially looked upon but the ſubſtance of Wine? VVhere he affirms the ſubſtance of Bread and VVine to remain in the Sacrament after Conſecration. To this he ſubjoyns: *For notwithſtanding that after the Myſtical Conſecration, Bread is not called Bread, nor the Wine, Wine, but the Body and Blood of Chriſt; yet after that which is ſeen, neither is any kind of Fleſh known in the Bread, nor in the Wine any drop of Blood.* Before, he told us, that the Bread and VVine remained in the Sacrament after Conſecration, as they were before; now he tells us, That after Conſecration, there is not any kind of Fleſh, nor one drop of Blood, *though the Bread be not called Bread, nor the Wine, Wine, but the Body and Blood of Chriſt*; where he granteth the denomination of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, but denyeth the verity and ſubſtance thereof; for he acknowledgeth nothing but the Bread and VVine, though they be not called ſo. This in ſubſtance he often repeateth, *for after the verity* (ſaith he) *the kind of creature which was before, is known ſtill to remain.* VVhat more conſpicuous?

Then addreſſing his Diſcourſe to his Adverſaries, he tells them, *That under the veile of Corporeal Bread and Wine, is the Spiritual Body and Blood of Chriſt.* So that the Bread and VVine remain Corporeally, but the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, Spiritually, by their vertue of Sanctification. And then preſently, compares this Sacrament to *Holy Baptiſme*, wherein the natural Element of VVater, which of it ſelf hath only power to waſh and cleanſe the Body, yet by *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution is impowered to cleanſe and ſanctifie the Soul, and yet ſtill remains the Natural Element of VVater, ſubject to corruption; and then applyes the VVater in *Baptiſme* to the Bread and VVine in the Holy Sacrament of the *Euchariſt*. Hence he proceeds to another ſimilitude, telling them, *That the Fathers of the Old Teſtament were Baptiſed in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, which produced a Spiritual effect, and yet ſuffered no Mutation: This again he parallelleth to the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. Then he tells them, *Likewiſe Manna given to the People from Heaven, and the Water flowing out of the Rock, were Corporeal, and Corporeally they fed the Peo-*

ple,

ple, and gave them drink; yet the Apoſtle nameth that Manna, and that Water, Spiritual Meat, and Spiritual Drink; and then he applyeth it to the Bread, and Wine, as before, which takes off all ambiguity of his meaning, for he drives at this, that the Bread and Wine, which remain in the Sacrament, though Natural, and Corporeal things, yet by the powerful operation of *Chriſt*, they are enabled, to produce in the Souls of the worthy Receivers, the ſame Spiritual Grace, and Sanctification, as if the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* were there really preſent; and therefore the Bread and Wine are called the Body and Blood of *Chriſt.*

He proceeds farther, ſaying, *Here alſo we ought to conſider what is meant by theſe words, except you ſhall eate the Fleſh of the Son of Man, and Drink his Blood, you ſhall have no life in you. He ſaid not, That his Fleſh which hanged on the Croſs, ſhould be eaten in pieces, and eaten of the Apoſtles; nor that his Blood which he ſhed for the Redemption of the World ſhould be given his Diſciples to drink; for it were a wicked thing, if his Fleſh ſhould be eaten, and his Blood drunk, as the Infidels took it.* And to confirm this, he

cites St. *Auguſtine*, upon the ſame Text of Scripture, of *Chriſt*'s commands, in theſe words. *He ſeemeth to command a wicked thing; therefore it is a Figure*, &c. *Thus St.* Auguſtine *affirmeth the Myſtery of the Body and Blood of* Chriſt, *to be celebrated of the Faithful, under a Figure; for he ſaith, It is no point of Religion, but rather of Iniquity, to take his Fleſh, and his Blood, as they did, which underſtood not* Chriſt's *words Spiritually, but Carnally, and went back.* Then he gives many examples in other like caſes, to ſhew, Why the Bread and Wine are called the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, becauſe of the Similitude they have with the things Signified, and ſo concludeth: *Wherefore the Myſteries be named, the Body and Blood of* Chriſt, *becauſe they take the appellation of things, whereof they be Sacraments.*

Aug. de Doctr. Chriſt. L. 3.

Then he cites ſeveral paſſages out of St. *Iſidore*, to confirm the ſame Opinion; of whom he ſaith, *Afterwards he declareth, what Sacraments are to be Celebrated among the Faithful; that is, the Sacrament of Baptiſme, and of the Body and Blood of* Chriſt. And here I deſire the *Reader* to take notice, by the way, that for above Eight hundred

year

years after *Christ*, there were but these Two Sacraments acknowledged in the Church of *Christ*, and consequently no more were Instituted by *Christ* himself. Yet the Church of *Rome* hath introduced Five more, which Antiquity never heard of, under the notion of Sacraments. Is it credible, that *Christ* should Institute for his Church Seven Sacraments, and yet communicate to the first Professors of *Christianity*, and their Successors, for Eight Centuries, the knowlsdge only of Two of them? This cannot be. The other Five were therefore Instituted by the Church of *Rome*; for the Council of *Trent* names Seven, and makes it an Article of Faith to believe them all Sacraments, and layes its Curse upon the Dishelievers. *Si quis dixerit Sacramenta novæ legis, non fuisse omnia à* Jesu Christo *Domino Nostro Instituta, aut esse plura vel pauciora quam septem*, videlicet, *Baptismum, Confirmationem, Eucharistiam, Pœnitentiam, extremam, Unctionem, Ordinem, & Matrimonium; aut etiam aliquod horum septem, non esse vere, & propriè Sacramentum; Anathema sit.* Which was formerly defin'd by the Council of *Florence*, under the same circumstances.

Trident. Sess. 7. *Can.* 1.

Florent. Decr. Eugenii a Arm.

ſtances. What judgment can we here frame? Examine Antiquity for Eight or Nine hundred years after *Chriſt*, that can give us no Intelligence of any more then Two Sacraments, and yet the Church of *Rome* ſtrictly commands the belief of Seven. Certainly the Subjects of that Church muſt have recourſe to their blind obedience, to ſubmit to ſuch Canons and Decrees as theſe. For if *Chriſt* did not Inſtitute thoſe Five pretended Sacraments, (as it is plain he did not) then the Church of *Rome* muſt have attempted to inſtitute them, not by appointing the matter, but by giving them the vertue of Sacraments, which is highly preſumptive, and a manifeſt violation of *Divine Right*; for none but *Chriſt* can ordain the means, and the vehicles, whereby he intended to convey his Spiritual Graces (which were the fruits of his Paſſion) to the Souls of the Faithful; this is his peculiar Prerogative. But this being a digreſſion from the matter in hand, I deſiſt, and leave it to the conſideration of the Judicious Reader.

Bertram now draws to the cloſe of his Firſt *Queſtion*, Whether the Body and Blood of *Chriſt* be contained in the Holy

Holy Sacrament in Verity, or in Figure? and concludes with these words, *Hitherto have we declared, that the Body and Blood of Christ, which are received in the Church, by the mouths of the Faithful, be Figures.* And so terminates this First *Question.*

SECT. VIII.

An Account of the Doctrine of Retram, *in reference to the second Question.*

THe Second *Question* that was to be resolved by *Retram*, or *Bertram*, was this, as he himself declares, *Whether the same Body that was Born of* Mary, *that Suffered, Dyed, was Buried, and sitteth on the Right hand of the Father, be that Body which is daily received in the Church, by the mouths of the Faithful, in the Mystery of the Sacrament, or no?* And first he discourseth out of St. *Ambrose*, That the substance of the Creatures suffer no Mutation, in these words, *For after the substance of the Creatures, they be even the same things after the Consecration, that they were before. For before the Consecration, they were Bread, and Wine, and after they appear to remain in the same kind still.* Where his Position is, That the substance of the Creatures are the same after Consecration, that they were before; which he proves thus; Before Consecration, they were Bread and Wine;

Ambr. L. 1. de Sacram.

Wine, and after Consecration, they not only appear to remain, but really do remain, in the same kind, still of Bread and Wine; this must be the drift of his Argument, for else it would not prove his intent.

Then having said, *That the Body and Blood of* Christ, *are not present in forme, but in vertue*; he applauds a distinction of St. *Ambrose: How diligently, and how wisely hath he made a distinction, where he saith, touching the flesh which was Crucified, and Buried: this is the true Flesh of* Christ; *but touching that which is received in the Sacrament, he saith, This is the Sacrament of the true Flesh; so dividing the Sacrament of the Flesh, from the very Flesh, &c. But he affirmeth the Mystery which is done in the Church, to be the Sacrament of the very Flesh, in which* Christ *Suffered, instructing the Faithful, that the Flesh in which* Christ *Suffered, and was Crucified and Buried, is not a Mystery, but the very Natural Flesh; but this Flesh which now containeth the Similitude of the very Flesh in Mystery, is not Flesh in Kind, nor in Forme, but in Sacrament. For, in Kind, it is Bread, &c.*

Hence

Hieron. in Epiſtolam Pauli ad Eph.

Hence he proceeds to the Autority of St. *Hierome*. *The Fleſh and the Blood of* Chriſt (ſaith he, St. *Hierom*) *are underſtood two manner of ways*; which he explicates, the one Corporeally, and the other Spiritually. *Therefore* (ſaith *Bertram*) *the Spiritual Fleſh, and the Spiritual Blood, which are daily received of the Faithful, do differ undoubtedly from the Fleſh Crucified, and the Blood ſhed, as the Autority of this Doctor doth witneſs.* Much to this purpoſe he diſcourſeth upon the Autority of St. *Auguſtine*, diſtinguiſhing between the Spiritual Food and the Corporeal Food of the Fathers of the Old Law, comparing them with us. Where he affirms, out of St. *Auguſtine*, that their Spiritual Food was the ſame with ours, the Body of *Chriſt*, but the Corporeal Food was very different, as much as the Manna, the Cloud, and the Sea differ from Bread and Wine: Which he confirms by the Autority of St. *Paul*, ſpeaking of the Antient Fathers that were Baptiſed in *Moſes*, in the Cloud, and in the Sea, and they all did eate the ſame Spiritual Meate, and drank the ſame Spiritual Drink, which he concludes to be *Chriſt* in a

Aug. in Evangelium Sancti Joan.

Figure,

Figure, as it is with us in the Sacrament, where he ſaith *Chriſt* is, in a certain manner, and *this manner is in Figure and Image.* Hence he draws this Illation; *Wherefore the Body and Blood, that we now celebrate in the Church, do differ from the Body, and the Blood, which are now known to be glorified by the Reſurrection; This Body is the Pledge, and the Figure, the other is the very Natural Body.* And preſently he adds, *And as the Figure diffe reth from the verity, thus it is plain, that the Myſtery of the Body and Blood of* Chriſt, *which is received of the Faithful, in the Church, differeth from the ſaid Body, that was Born of* Mary *the Virgin,* &c.

Then he cites St. *Auſtin*'s words, Preaching to the People of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt. The thing which you ſee in the Altar of* God (ſaith St. *Auſtin*) *was ſeen of you the laſt night; but what it is, or what it meaneth, or of how great a thing it containeth the Sacrament, ye have not yet heard. The thing which you ſee is* Bread and Wine. He then tells them, That by Faith they

Aug. Serm. ad Populum.

they ought to believe, the Bread to be the Body, and the Wine to be the Blood of *Chriſt*. And then he makes them object, that the Body of *Chriſt* that was Born of the *Virgin*, &c. with his Blood, Aſcended entirely into Heaven, where he now is; How then can this Bread be his Body, and this Wine his Blood? St. *Auſtin* Anſwers, *Theſe, good Brethren, be called Sacraments, becauſe that one thing is ſeen in them, and another thing underſtood; that which is ſeen, hath a Corporeal form, and that which is not ſeen hath a Spiritual Fruit.* Whereupon *Bertram* adds, *In theſe words, this worſhipful Author inſtructing us, what we ought to think of the proper Body of the Lord, that was Born of* Mary, *&c. Alſo what we ought to think of the Body ſet on the Altar, whereof the People be partakers. The very Body is whole, and not divided with any Section, neither cover'd with any Figures; but this Body ſet on the Table of the Lord, is a Figure, becauſe it is a Sacrament.* And again, *Therefore St.* Auſtin *hath Taught us, that as the Body of* Chriſt *is ſignified in the Bread, which is on the Altar, ſo is the Body of the People that receive it.*

Then

Then Addreſſing his Diſcourſe to the Emperor, he ſaith, *Your Wiſdom (moſt excellent Prince) may perceive, that I have proved, by the Teſtimonies of Holy Scripture, and of the Holy Fathers, that the Bread which is called the Body of* Chriſt, *and the Cup called his Blood, is a Figure, becauſe it is a Myſtery. And that there is no ſmall difference between the Myſtical Body, and the Body that Suffered, was Buried, and Roſe again; for this which ſuffered, is the proper Body of our Saviour; neither in it is any Figure, or Signification, but the manifeſt action of the thing it ſelf,* &c.

And thus he concludes his Anſwer to the Emperor, inſiſting all along upon this Truth, That in this Holy Sacrament is contained the ſame Bread, and Wine, that was before, which are called the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, becauſe they Myſtically, and Figuratively, ſignifie the ſame, and are Received by the Faithful, by way of *Commemoration* of *Chriſt*'s Paſſion, and by vertue of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, they Sanctifie the Receiver; but ſtill denies, that the True Body and Blood of

of *Chriſt*, which was Born of the *Virgin Mary*, Suffered, *&c.* is in *Verity*, or *Reality*, preſent in this Sacrament, but only Figuratively, and Myſtically.

SECT. IX.

SECT. IX.

Animadverſions on the Premiſes.

WE have ſeen the Opinion of thoſe Two Champions of the Church of *Chriſt*, which were Conſulted by *Charles* the Emperor. To whom I might add many more Abbots, Biſhops, and Archbiſhops, and the moſt eminent Perſons of thoſe times, for Learning and Vertue, but this would be too prolix, and contrary to my Deſign.

But, in the Firſt place let us reflect, that after *Retram* had Written his *Treatiſe* of the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, How all the Biſhops and Prelates of *France*, could precedently elect him, in a matter of ſo great conſequence, to defend the *Latin* Church againſt the Pretenſions of the *Greeks*, and rely chiefly upon his management of it? Eſpecially ſince Pope *Nicholas* the Firſt (who had excited them to this Debate) approved

approved of their Choice; for, had they found any flaw in his Doctrine, as not conformable to the Antient Belief of the Church, they might with Reaſon have ſuſpected, that he might have vented ſome other error in his Diſputes with the *Greeck* Church, which would utterly have ruin'd their Cauſe. But no ſuch thing was ſurmis'd of him, nor objected againſt him: whence we may certainly infer, That all the Biſhops and Prelates of the *Gallican* Church, yea, and the Pope alſo, were of his Opinion in the Doctrine of the *Euchariſt*. To this we may add, That Pope *Adrian* the Second (who alſo Govern'd the Church, during this Debate) never oppoſed himſelf againſt the Doctrine of *Retram*, nor never Reprehended him for it, which, notwithſtanding, he ought to have done, had he deem'd it any way Heterodox. For, as *Gratian* tells us, *He approves an Error, which he doth not oppoſe:* eſpecially if by his Office he ought to do it. And becauſe during this Ninth Century, there were ſo few that adher'd to the Doctrine of *Paſchaſius*, it ſeemed very inconſiderable, and like to dye of it ſelf, for want of ſupport, and therefore

Gratian. in Decret. Diſt. 82. C. Error.

therefore was prudently not reflected upon. Whence we may ſafely conclude, that the General Belief of the Church, till almoſt Nine Hundred years after *Chriſt*, was conformable to the Doctrine of *Retram*, and of *John Erigéne*, who denyed the Exiſtence of *Chriſt*'s Body and Blood, in the Holy Sacrament, in Verity and Reality; and admitted it Virtually, Figuratively, and by way of a Sacrament. Which belief maugre all the Anathemaes of the Church of *Rome*, is lineally deſcended from *Chriſt*, and his Apoſtles, to theſe our times, and is the general perſwaſion of the *Proteſtant* Church of *England*, and conformable to the Nine and Thirty Articles.

Seconly, Conſider, which of theſe two Dogmatical Aſſertions is moſt like to be the genuine and legitimate offſpring of *Chriſt*, either that which drew his Origine immediately from *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles, and hath kept poſſeſſion ever ſince; or the other, that was not ſtarted till Eight Hundred years after, and knows no other Progenitor but *Paſchaſius*? The firſt certainly will appear to the unbiaſſed judg-

ment of all, to be Legitimate; and the second Spurious, and Adulterate.

But *Thirdly*, Here is yet a higher Point, which presents it self to our consideration. We all believe that the Divine Word, pursuant to his efficacious Decree, became Incarnate chiefly for this end, That, in Human Nature, he might Redeem Mankind; he accomplished this end, by a cruel Death, and other Indignities, which he suffered, and thereby satisfied for our Transgressions, and Merited for us an infinite Treasure of Graces; and to the end that Mankind might participate of this ineffable benefit, for all future ages, he instituted a Church, ordained Sacraments, to convey those Graces to our Souls. He instructed those, that were to initiate his Church, in his Divine Doctrine; he gave them his Heavenly Precepts, *&c.*

Whence I appeal to the impartial and unbyassed judgments, both of Men and Angels, whether it be probable, or credible, that this Supreme Artificer, instructed with all his infinite Attributes of an illimited Knowledge, Power,

Power, Wiſdom, Providence, *&c.* ſhould leave this great Work of our Redemption (which was his Maſterpiece) imperfect, and incompleat; yea, contaminated with groſs Errors, and Hereſies, in its firſt Foundation, in a matter of ſuch high moment, which concerned his moſt Sacred Body, and Blood, and was deſtructive of the Eſſentials, of one of thoſe two Sacraments, which he had ordain'd, and the Principal for Dignity, and permit its progreſs in this erroneous Doctrine, for Eight Hundred years together, which would have had a direct tendency to confuſion, and finally, to the utter ruine and diſſolution of his Church, and ſo fruſtrate the final end of his Incarnation? And that after ſo many Centuries, one *Paſchaſius Rathert*, a Monk, ſhould ſtart up from his Cell, and pretend to Correct this Error, and hereby to perfect and amend the work of the Omnipotent, as if *Chriſt* would not, or could not have done it of himſelf. Is this, I ſay, credible? or, Would it not highly derogate from the Dignity of the Divine Perſon, and the infinite Attributes of our great Lord and Maſter? What then muſt we conclude? But that this

belief of the Body, and Blood of *Chriſt*, which took its Origine from the Primitive Inſtitution of Chriſtianity, was True, Orthodox, and Catholick Doctrine; ſo that *Chriſt* accompliſht the deſign which he had undertaken, perfectly and compleatly, and ſo remitted it to Poſterity, without either ſpot or blemiſh.

And if you deſire Preſidents, do but caſt a compendious glance, upon all the former products of the Omnipotent hand of God. The Frame of this Univerſe was Projected and Created by God himſelf, who having produc't it, he ſaw that it was very good; that is, perfect, and compleat. He Created the Angels, with all the Natural Perfections due to the excellency of their Nature; no accompliſhment was wanting: and moreover, in their firſt Creation, imbued them with Supernatural Grace, and gave them a Title to Glory, *Simul in eis condens naturam, & largiens gratiam*, ſaith St. *Auſtin.* The ſame ſaith St. *Gregory*, in his Morals, and others. Man was likewiſe produc't in his full perfection, and his Soul, in its firſt Creation, was imbelliſht with Sanctifying

Aug. L. 12. de Civit. C. 9.

Sactifying Grace, and Original Juſtice. The Superior Orbes were Created, and placed in their reſpective Sphears, with all the Accompliſhment of Perfection proper to their Nature, with due Subordination, conducing to the good and perſervation of the Univerſe; their Natural Motion was imprinted into them in their firſt Creation, which ſtill remains immutable, though probably their rapt motion be regulated by the Miniſtery of Angels. And in this ſublunary World, there is not one Species, but in its firſt being, received all the Perfections, which were appropriated to its kind. So that all the Works of God were perfect and compleat; though ſome of the Angels, and the Firſt Man *Adam*, which were Created free, fell from the happy State they were Created in, by the perverſe uſe of their Free-wills.

Who then ſhall dare preſume, to aſperſe the Laſt Work of the Incarnate Word, with any Pretended Imperfection, and render it Heterogeneal from the reſt? For he is the ſame Omnipotent God, that Created all thoſe things mentioned, and his Power is not Abridg'd, nor his Will Chang'd; for

he is Essentially uncapable of any Error, Mutation, or Imperfection. It remains therefore, that the Opinion of *Paschasius*, Teaching, the Real Existence of *Christ*'s Body and Blood in the *Eucharist*, was a New, Heterodox, and Erroneous Doctrine, discrepating from the constant Belief of the Church, from the begining till that time.

And hence is evinced the falsity of that Erroneous Doctrine, that asserts the Literal, and Oral Manducation of *Christ*'s Glorified Body in the Communion; for if that Glorified Body be not Actually, Really, Physically, and Locally present in the *Eucharist*, then the Receiver cannot exercise any such Oral Manducation of it. Wherefore this Position is repugnant to Autority of Scripture, and Fathers; it is against Antiquity, and Reason.

The Church of *Rome* was once Immaculate, and retain'd its Original Innocency for many years. But, as the Angels, though perfect in their Creation, yet by their Swelling Thoughts, Aspired to Sublimer Prerogatives, not allowed

lowed to their Limited Perfections, fall from that happy State of their Primitive Creation; ſo the Church of *Rome*, when many high and Soaring Spirits met together in Councils, Relying upon their Pretended Infallibility, Uſurpt a Power of Swaying all things belonging to the Church, and Religion, according to their own fancy; then they began to Abrogate ſome things of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, and Superinduce others of their own; they made ſeveral Commutations, and Reformations, exceeding the limits of their Power, as hath been proved in this *Treatiſe:* So that now their Church is like a confus'd *Chaos*, retaining ſome things of *Chriſt*'s Inſtitution, commixt with others of their own Human Invention, and ſo have loſt that Purity and Perfection, which once they enjoy'd; And which the Proteſtant Church of *England* ſtill retains in its Primitive and Original Purity and Integrity.

And here I cloſe up this *Diſcourſe* of *Religion*, wherein, whatſoever I have delivered, I humbly ſubmit to

the *Cenſure*, and *Correction* of thoſe, upon whom it is incumbent, to Regulate the Belief and Practiſe of the Proteſtant *Church* of *England.*

A N

AN INDEX OF THE *Diſputations* and *Sections*.

Diſpute I.

Of the Pretended Infallibility of the Church of *Rome*.

SECT. I. *Wherein conſiſts the true Notion of Infallibility.*

Sect. II. *The Grounds of the Pretended Infallibility of the Church of* Rome *are propoſed.*

Sect. III. *The Deciſion of the Preſent Controverſie.*

Sect. IV:

Sect. IV. *An Answer to the Objections proposed against the Nullity of the Church of* Rome's *Infallibility.*

Dispute II.

Of the Intrenchments of the Church of *Rome* upon Divine Right, by Changing the Essentials of their Pretended Sacraments.

Sect. I. *The Doctrine of the Church of* Rome *relating to this present Controversie.*

Sect. II. *The Practise of Antiquity in the Collation of Priesthood.*

Sect. III. *A brief account of the Rituals of the* Greeks, Maronites, *&c.*

Sect. IV. *Shewing, that the Church of* Rome *placeth the Essence of the Ordination*

nation of Prieſts in touching the Veſſels, and the Forme annexed to it.

Sect. V. *The Order of Prieſthood, according to the preſent Inſtitution, cannot be validly conferr'd, by touching the Veſſels, with this Forme,* Accipe poteſtatem, *&c.*

Sect. VI. *An Anſwer to the Objections propoſed by the Divines of the Church of* Rome, *againſt the Invalidity of their Ordination.*

Sect. VII. *The Solution of other Objections againſt the ſame Doctrine.*

Sect. VIII. *An Illation drawn from the Premiſes, of the Invalidity of Ordination in the Church of* England, *ſolved.*

Sect. IX. *Conſectaries drawn from the Proofes of the precedent aſſertion.*

Sect. X. *Of Clandeſtine Marriage.*

Sect. 11. *The Arguments to vindicate the Nullity of Clandeſtine Marriage Anſwered.*

Diſpute III.

Diſpute III.

Of Communion in one Kind.

Sect. I. *The Grounds of the Church of* Rome *for denying the Chalice to the Laity.*

Sect. II. *The Deciſion of this Controverſie.*

Sect. III. *The Objections Solved.*

Sect. IV. *Corallaries drawn from the* Romaniſts *Doctrine, of their pretended Sacrifice of the Maſs.*

Diſpute IV.

Of Tranſubſtantiation.

Sect. I. *The* Romaniſts *Doctrine relating to Tranſubſtantiation.*

Sect. II.

Sect. II. *The Orthodox Doctrine against Tranſubſtantiation, propoſed and proved.*

Sect. III. *Of the poſſibility of Tranſubſtantiation, as held by the Church of* Rome.

Sect. IV. *Objections for Tranſubſtantiation ſolved.*

Diſpute V.

Of the Real Preſence.

SEct. I. *The Church of* Romes *Definitions concerning the Real Preſence.*

Sect. II. *Other Subtilties ariſing from the former Deciſions, not fully determin'd.*

Sect. III. *The Inutility of multiplying Definitions of this Nature.*

Sect. IV. *The Objections Solved.*

The INDEX.

Sect. V. *When, and from whom, this Doctrine of the Real Presence took its first rise.*

Sect. VI. *A Briefe Account of some passages of the Life and Death of* John Erigene.

Sect. VII. *Some Passages of the Life and Doctrine of* Retram.

Sect. VIII. *An Account of the Doctrine of* Retram, *in reference to the Second Question.*

Sect. IX. *Animadversions on the Premises.*

FINIS.